

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS (BSA)

In the matter of

Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC)
Applicant Review Panel (ARP) Public Meeting

555 Capitol Mall, 4th Floor, Suite 455
Sacramento, CA 95814

MONDAY, JULY 19, 2010
9:30 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Kerri Spano, Meeting Chair

Raul Villanueva, Her Assistant

Nasir Ahmadi

Lynne Reich, His Assistant

Mary Camacho

Bob La Liberte, Her Assistant

Staff Present

Stephanie Ramirez-Ridgeway, Panel Counsel

Diane Hamel, Executive Secretary

Steven B. Russo, Chief of Investigations

Also Present

Public Comment

Jim Wright, Voter

Malka Kopell, CAforward

Astrid Garcia, NALGO Education Fund

David Pacheco, AARP

Kathay Feng, Common Cause

I N D E X

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Proceedings | 4 |
| ITEM 1. Approval of minutes from June 30, 2010, Panel Meeting | 4 |
| ITEM 2. Announcements | 5 |
| ITEM 3. Staff Report - Steven B. Russo, Bureau of State Audits, Chief of Investigations - Report on the bureau's activities in support of the panel, including forwarding application materials, confirming applicant eligibility, and gathering information concerning applicants | 13 |
| ITEM 4. Panel Counsel's Report | 21 |
| ITEM 5. Public Comment about Applicants | 23 |
| ITEM 6. Applicant Selection and Reduction of Applicant Pool | 39 |
| Public Comment about Applicants | 83 |
| ITEM 7. Discussion relating to requests for additional information from or about remaining applicants, remaining applicant selection phases, interview schedule, process, and questions | 102 |
| Public Comment | 105 |
| ITEM 8. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda | 107 |
| Meeting recessed | 113 |
| Certificate of Reporter | 114 |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

JULY 19, 2010 9:32 A.M.

CHAIR SPANO: The hour being 9:30 a.m., and a quorum being present. I now call to order the July 19th, 2010, Meeting of the Applicant Review Panel to order. Secretary, would you please call the roll?

MS. HAMEL: Mr. Ahmadi - Here; Ms. Camacho - Here; Ms. Spano - Here.

CHAIR SPANO: Our first item of business is the approval of the minutes from our last meeting of June 30th. Copies of the Draft Minutes are available at the back of the room. Are there any public comments on the Draft Minutes of our last meeting? Has each member of the panel had an opportunity to review the Draft Minutes?

MS. CAMACHO: Yes, I did.

MR. AHMADI: We have.

CHAIR SPANO: Okay. Do they accurately reflect the actions taken at the last meeting?

MS. CAMACHO: Yes, they do.

MR. AHMADI: Yes.

CHAIR SPANO: Okay, the I move that we adopt those as Final Draft Minutes for the June 30th, 2010 meeting, as prepared by staff. All in favor?

(Ayes.) All opposed? There being no opposition,

1 the motion is carried.

2 Now that we have concluded our first order of
3 business, the second item of business is Announcements.
4 Well, Mary and Nasir, this has been a long and complicated
5 meeting and I have prepared some - this is going to be a
6 long and complicated meeting - and I have prepared some
7 notes and just want to let the public know that I have
8 jotted some things down so I can keep it straight since we
9 have a lot of work to do ahead of us today.

10 I would like to provide the members of the public
11 a guide on how we intend to accomplish our work this week.
12 As many of you know, we have already noted on our Agenda
13 this meeting is scheduled to last for as many as seven
14 days. I am not sure we will need to meet the full seven
15 days, it all depends on how long it takes for us to
16 accomplish our work. To set the stage for what we intend
17 to accomplish at this meeting, I would like to begin where
18 we left off. At our last meeting, we continued our work
19 at narrowing the pool of Applicants. The action we took
20 last time resulted in 314 Applicants remaining in the
21 pool, which reflected 113 registered Republicans, 115
22 registered Democrats, and 86 Applicants not registered as
23 neither Democrat or Republican, or who you will hear us
24 often refer to as the group of "the others." I mention
25 party affiliation of the Applicants because, as you know,

1 our task is to ultimately narrow the pool of 60 of the
2 most qualified in sub-pools of 20 of the most qualified
3 Republicans, 20 of the most qualified Democrats, and 20 of
4 the most qualified individuals who are not registered as
5 either of those two parties.

6 The task before us this week is to narrow the pool
7 of Applicants from 314 Applicants remaining in the pool to
8 120 individuals we intend to interview in early August
9 through mid-September. We need this sub-pool of 120
10 Applicants to include 40 of the most qualified Democrats,
11 40 of the most qualified Republicans, and 40 of the most
12 qualified others, or, as we are going to refer to, what
13 can I say, "Applicants not registered as either Democrats
14 or Republicans."

15 Since our last meeting of June 30th, each of us
16 went back to individually review further the Applicant
17 materials of the 314 Applicants remaining in the pool, and
18 we attempted to further narrow our recommended Applicants
19 to 40 of the most qualified Democrats, 40 of the most
20 qualified Republicans, and 40 of the most qualified
21 Others. We have each provided our individual
22 recommendations to Counsel, but we have not seen our
23 fellow Panelists' recommendations.

24 Over the course of this meeting, we will consider
25 the 314 Applicants who currently remain in each of these

1 sub-pools, the 113 Republicans, 115 Democrats, the 86
2 Others, and further narrow each of these sub-pools to 40.
3 This is our task for this week.

4 Mary and Nasir, to accomplish this task, I would
5 like to propose a way for us to go about our work. First,
6 I believe we should begin today by reviewing the various
7 reports that staff have prepared for us and plans to
8 distribute to all of us later. As we all know, and the
9 public should know by now, we do not seek reports prior to
10 the meeting because of the restrictions of the Bagley-
11 Keene Act. These reports contain information that informs
12 us of the recommendations each of us is now making,
13 concerning each Applicant remaining in the pool of 316.
14 Our task coming into this meeting was to attempt to
15 identify 120 individuals we thought were the most
16 qualified to serve on the Citizens Redistricting
17 Commission. Hopefully, all of us will have favorably
18 recommended many of the same Applicants, but we will need
19 to see the reports, as we do not know.

20 After receiving these reports, I would suggest
21 that we recess for about 35-45 minutes, perhaps longer, so
22 that we can retire to our respective offices and review
23 the reports in-depth. Second, when we reconvene after
24 receiving these reports, I would like to recommend that we
25 take action to eliminate from the pool all those

1 Applicants that none of us recommended, which may include
2 Applicants who have a conflict, or for some other reason.

3 Once we have narrowed the pool in this way, I
4 would suggest that we approach our work as follows: first,
5 I would recommend that we proceed by working on the sub-
6 pools based on party affiliation. The Voters First Act
7 requires us to ultimately identify sub-pools of the most
8 qualified, based on the party affiliation, as Republicans,
9 Democrats, and Others. So, at this point, I believe we
10 should be focusing our work in that way. With this in
11 mind, I further suggest we tackle the group of Others,
12 first, then move to the Republicans, and then, finally,
13 the Democrats in the pool. And using that general
14 framework, I would like to propose further how we might go
15 about the logistics of narrowing each of these sub-pools
16 to 40.

17 As we all know, we came to this meeting with a
18 proposed list of 40 Republicans, 40 Democrats, and 40
19 Others. Reports provided by Counsel will show us areas
20 where we are all in agreement. So, for example, we will
21 be able to see from the report that all three of us
22 favorably recommended X number of Republicans, X number of
23 Democrats, and X number of Others. In other words, these
24 are people who appear in the group of our Top 40 List.
25 Although we may ultimately decide not to keep some of

1 these people in the Applicant Pool, I propose that we
2 begin our deliberations on each of these three sub-pools
3 by initially placing these Applicants in a tentative pool
4 of 40. Then, I recommend that we begin our discussion of
5 those Applicants we think should be added to the tentative
6 list of 40. At that point, I think each of us is prepared
7 to advocate for those Applicants we think we would like to
8 interview, and to listen to each other very carefully as
9 we advocate for other Applicants.

10 Our goal is to agree on the 40 of the most
11 qualified individuals for each of these three sub-pools,
12 and to ensure that each sub-pool is diverse in all five
13 characteristics of diversity, race, ethnicity, gender,
14 geography, and economic status. This will be a give and
15 take process, and though we have limited time, we really
16 need to listen to each other's perspectives before we
17 decide on the final 40 sub-pool.

18 I think we all need to be comfortable suggesting
19 Applicants as we feel necessary, keep suggesting
20 Applicants, until we have a good group of 40 or more we
21 want to interview. Before we vote to move that group of
22 40 forward, I propose that we take public comments, and
23 then take a break of 45 minutes or so, and during those
24 breaks - or 30 minutes or so - and during those breaks, I
25 think we should go back to our offices, really look at the

1 sub-pool of 40. We all need to make sure that we are not
2 leaving out someone that we think should be interviewed,
3 or left in someone who we think should not be interviewed.
4 We also need to have a good balance in each sub-pool, so
5 that one party does not
6 have an advantage or a disadvantage over another.

7 Once we have reviewed the tentative pool of 40 and
8 reconvened, I think we should discuss any proposed
9 changes, if any, and then vote the entire sub-pool of 40
10 as a slate. I would also recommend that we bear in mind
11 the need to limit the amount of time that we spend
12 discussing any one candidate. Some discussions may be
13 brief, others longer, but for some pools that could be
14 larger, I think we need to remember to make sure we use
15 our time efficiently in discussing Applicants before we
16 make our decisions.

17 And finally, there may be times that we may agree
18 to disagree, to move forward in our work, to keep the
19 spirit of cooperation in these discussions. So to sustain
20 focus is our larger goal to ensure the spirit in working
21 together and the surest way of meeting our
22 responsibilities as defined in the law.

23 Mary and Nasir, do you think this is a workable
24 approach for you both?

25 MR. AHMADI: Madam Chair, if I can just for

1 clarification to make sure that I understood correctly,
2 your proposed approach, for the most part, is going to
3 provide us with the efficiency that we need to have
4 because, as you stated, this meeting is going to be a long
5 one. One area that I wanted to clarify is, if I heard you
6 correctly, you said that when we receive the list of all
7 those Applicants who did not receive any favorable vote, I
8 think we should leave an option open in terms of any
9 amendments that may be needed on that list before we
10 approach the vote on that, so that is the only
11 clarification that I wanted to make.

12 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, good point. Did you have
13 anything that you would like to discuss about this?

14 MS. CAMACHO: No, my same concern was with what
15 Nasir is saying, is that, because we are going to get some
16 public input, that could kind of - may help us.

17 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, it could change our decision,
18 okay.

19 MS. CAMACHO: I would say that we need to kind of
20 look at those three no votes and discuss them and, if need
21 be, then we can vote on them.

22 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, so we are confident those are
23 the 40 that need to be - okay, that sounds perfectly fine.
24 Is there anything else that you wanted to note?

25 MR. AHMADI: No, I am fine with that.

1 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. So, finally, there are a
2 couple other things I want to make sure that the public
3 should know. We are going to try to run through the
4 agenda in order today. Once we have worked through the
5 first five items, we will start focusing on the other sub-
6 pool of the Applicants who are either registered as
7 Democrats or Republicans. I think we need to finish that
8 group today if we can; however, before we recess tonight,
9 Counsel has asked that we remember to take up the issue of
10 interview schedule so that, after we make our decision,
11 staff can begin working on the schedule we adopt.

12 Additionally, just like last time we will have
13 laptops in the back of the room, so members of the public
14 can review the materials that we have before us as the
15 meeting progresses. We are also hopeful that staff can
16 update the Applicant pool posted on the Website soon, but
17 it may not happen until next week. We will take periodic
18 breaks throughout the meeting. It is also possible that,
19 to complete our business, we may need to limit the maximum
20 time of public comment that the individual may need to
21 speak, or the amount of time allocated for a particular
22 matter. During periods of public comment, public will
23 confine their comments to the pending motion, or during
24 public comment period.

25 Does any member of the Panel have any

1 announcements they would like to make before we move on?

2 MS. CAMACHO: I do not have any.

3 MR. AHMADI: No, I do not have any.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Let's proceed to the next item, the
5 third item of business on our agenda is a report by Steven
6 Russo, the Bureau Chief of Investigations, who has a
7 report on the Bureau's activities in support of the Panel,
8 including forwarding application materials, confirming
9 applicant eligibility, and gathering information
10 concerning Applicants. Mr. Russo, would you please begin?

11 MR. RUSSO: Thank you, Ms. Spano. Since the Panel's
12 last meeting, the Bureau staff has been busy and engaged in a
13 number of projects in support of the panel's activities.
14 Probably the most noteworthy at this point has been the work
15 that staff has been doing to confirm the eligibility of the
16 Applicants to serve as members of the Commission under Article
17 21, Section 2(C)(3) of the California Constitution, which is a
18 provision of the Voters First Act that requires members of the
19 Commission to have voted in two of the last three statewide
20 General Elections, and to have been registered continuously
21 since November 18th, 2005, with the same Political party, or
22 with no Political party.

23 As a result of doing our investigative work into that,
24 primarily looking at the registration records held by the
25 Secretary of State's Office, and by the individual counties, we

1 identified 15 Applicants who were did not satisfy the
2 eligibility requirements for serving on the Commission,
3 primarily because they had not maintained that continuous party
4 registration throughout the five-year period. And based on what
5 we found, we contacted the Applicants, gave them an opportunity
6 to provide us with input, or to contact the Registrar of the
7 particular counties to try to deal with the Registrar, to work
8 out any difficulties for any mistakes that may have been made.
9 Some folks were able to help us clarify some records, so it was
10 a true give and take process, but, as the final result of it, we
11 did identify 15 people who did not meet the eligibility
12 requirements, and we provided reports to the Panel explaining
13 what we found and what the Applicant's position was regarding
14 what we found. In most instances, it was agreement that,
15 indeed, on checking the records, yes, they did not meet the
16 five-year requirement. So, we have provided reports to the
17 Panel on that with a recommendation that those individuals be
18 eliminated from the current pool of 314 Applicants.

19 In addition, we have responded to other questions that
20 have been posed to us by members of the Panel, primarily
21 questions related to Applicants apparently not disclosing family
22 members because there would be, in an essay, some reference to a
23 wife or children, or so forth, but those people were not listed
24 in the Application, and part of the Supplemental Application,
25 concerning family information. So, we contacted those

1 individuals had gotten them to file amendments to their
2 applications to make sure you have all of the information that
3 you need.

4 Also, we received questions from the Panel regarding
5 the employment activities of certain Applicants, that these
6 employment activities by the Applicant, himself, herself, or by
7 a spouse, might have suggested potential lobbying activities
8 within the last 10 years, which would be a conflict of interest.
9 We have looked into that and there were not any instances where
10 we confirmed lobbying activity, but we certainly relayed what we
11 found to the Panel, and for the Panel's consideration. And with
12 all these reports that we prepare, in generating those reports,
13 we also post the reports to the Bureau's Website,
14 WeDrawTheLines.com, and so that it is available to any member of
15 the public who wants to know what we found regarding an
16 Applicant, and also to make it clear that what information we
17 are providing to the Panel, and providing any member of the
18 public who has some question about what we found, or may have
19 additional information, to provide that information through the
20 public comment process.

21 Regarding the public comment process, we have been
22 actively involved in maintaining that process of receiving
23 written comments from the public, to reviewing them to make sure
24 there was nothing in them that was offensive, to making sure
25 that there was nothing that did not meet our standard for

1 competency, that it was not someone just making a false
2 aspersion, someone who was making an accusation without any
3 evidence behind it, making sure that it met our minimum
4 standards for public comments, providing the Applicant with an
5 opportunity to respond to whatever the public comment was, and
6 then posting that comment on the Website, making it available to
7 the Panel so that they could consider those comments in making
8 their difficult decisions regarding who should move forward in
9 the application process.

10 What has kept us probably most busy since the Panel
11 last met, has of course been the collection of the Form 700 from
12 all of the Applicants. I am pleased to say that, of the 314
13 Applicants, that all but two submitted a Form 700 to us. One of
14 those individuals decided that it was not worth it to him to go
15 through the work involved getting his particular circumstances
16 of filling out the Form 700, so he asked to withdraw from the
17 process; another of the Applicants simply did not submit the
18 form, but we have provided that information to the Panel so they
19 know who submitted the form and who did not, and is therefore
20 ineligible; if you did not submit the form, you are not eligible
21 to move forward in the process.

22 Additionally, there were two individuals who submitted
23 a Form 700 late, but within 48 hours of the deadline, and those
24 individuals have now submitted their forms, they are requesting
25 to stay in the Applicant pool, and have submitted information as

1 their justification for why they did not make the deadline, so
2 that the Panel can consider whether or not they wish to allow
3 them to continue on in the pool, despite the fact that they
4 submitted a late Form 700, or not, and in your discretion.

5 After receiving the Form 700s, we have been reviewing
6 those forms to look for obvious issues of conflict of interest
7 or issues related to not completing the form properly. After
8 this review, we have not found any obvious instances of
9 conflict. We did find certain circumstances where it appears an
10 individual did not provide all of the information required. One
11 issue that was of particular note was individuals not disclosing
12 spousal income, apparently seeing it as a large enough issue
13 that it appears that, in the instructions for the form, some
14 people simply did not understand what the requirement was and,
15 in their applications, they would list a spouse having certain
16 employment, and then, on the Form 700, we would not see that
17 reflected on the Form, so we will be contacting those
18 individuals who remain in the Applicant pool after the Panel
19 finishes for this week, and we will be having them amend their
20 Form 700 to accurately reflect their economic interests. And,
21 as a part of that, what we will be doing is posting on our
22 Website a mechanism for Applicants to submit an amended Form 700
23 so that they will find it very similar to the original form, the
24 interactive form, so that they will find it hopefully convenient
25 to fill out the form and provide the updated information to us.

1 And that is what we have been doing so far. Ahead of
2 us, however, we have a very large task in that, once you reduce
3 the Applicant pool down to 120, then at that point, as I told
4 you in the past, we will be doing a much more thorough
5 examination of the Applicants, looking for conflicts of
6 interest, particularly conflicts of interest generated by their
7 family members, that has been an area that we have not spent a
8 lot of time on thus far, maybe because of the numbers involved,
9 that if every Applicant has family members, you know, you can
10 see that that exponentially increases the workload. But now,
11 with you bringing the pool down to 120, we will certainly be
12 looking at that, and we will also be looking on a selective
13 basis to confirm the information provided by the Applicants.
14 This is our opportunity to look at the particular things people
15 are saying, to look at their letters of recommendation, and to
16 confirm the information provided. Obviously, we are not going
17 to be checking and confirming every single little piece of
18 information from every single applicant, but the Applicants must
19 know, as you must know, as the public must know, that anything
20 that is contained in an application will be subject to
21 verification and that we certainly will be looking for anything
22 that looks out of the ordinary, or we will simply be looking at
23 particularly important pieces of information in application
24 information that we think would be particularly significant to
25 the Panel in making their decisions, and information that we

1 think that, if we can provide that information to you soon
2 enough, areas that you may want to ask Applicants about during
3 the interview process, so that you are armed with as much
4 information as possible as you are going through the process of
5 talking with the Applicants and meeting with them face-to-face
6 regarding the qualifications that they have stated in their
7 applications. And so, with that, I think that is my update at
8 this point as to what we have been doing and what we will be
9 doing, but if you have any questions, I am happy to respond.

10 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, Steven.

11 MS. CAMACHO: Steven, I just want to clarify, so
12 pretty much the voter information, so the Applicant verification
13 that the Applicant voted in the last two of the three Primary -

14 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: General.

15 MS. CAMACHO: -- General Elections, and that they have
16 been continuously registered as a voter within California and
17 for the same Political party, that has been completed for the
18 314?

19 MR. RUSSO: That has been completed, yes.

20 MS. CAMACHO: Okay. Also, in the sense of any
21 lobbying activities, that has been looked at for the Applicants,
22 themselves, correct?

23 MR. RUSSO: It has been looked at for the Applicants,
24 themselves, certainly for whether they are registered with the
25 Secretary of State's Office as a State Lobbyist, and whether

1 they are registered with the Congress as a Federal Lobbyist. We
2 have also looked at local jurisdictions that have lobbying
3 ordinances. Certain cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles,
4 Oakland, have lobbying ordinances that require lobbyists to
5 register and we have looked there, and we have done that. There
6 are, however, a number of Special Districts that exist in the
7 State, actually several hundred, and that is a more difficult
8 process just because there are so many of them, so to check
9 that, what we are going to have to do is be looking at specific
10 Applicants when you are down to the 120 because, rather than
11 blanketing hundreds of special districts to try to look for a
12 needle in a haystack, we would rather find a needle first, that
13 is to say, the Applicant who is engaged in activities in a
14 particular jurisdiction, or who engaged in activities that would
15 be likely to involve lobbying activities, and then look
16 specifically at that for any connection that would be prohibited
17 lobbying activity.

18 MS. CAMACHO: Okay, so then basically it is just the
19 Special Districts that will need to be looked at for these
20 Applicants, for maybe certain Applicants, and then maybe some
21 family information.

22 MR. RUSSO: That is correct.

23 MS. CAMACHO: Okay, I just wanted to clarify that.
24 Thank you.

25 MR. RUSSO: No other questions.

1 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you, Steven.

2 MR. RUSSO: Okay, thank you.

3 CHAIR SPANO: Would any members of the public like to
4 comment on Steven's Report?

5 CHAIR SPANO: Seeing no comment, I want to direct your
6 attention to the fourth item of business. The next agenda item
7 is Panel Counsel's Report. Counsel, please begin.

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Once
9 again, we have prepared a series of reports for your use during
10 this long meeting and, in fact, today we have a total of 10
11 reports. The first report is one that lists by name, "The 142
12 Applicants Who Did Not Receive a Favorable Recommendation From
13 Any Panelist." Next, we have grouped the remaining reports by
14 party affiliation, so, for example, you have a report indicating
15 the 17 Democrats who at this point have received three favorable
16 recommendations, a report describing the demographics of that
17 group of 17 individuals, and a list of the Democrats who have
18 received one or two favorable recommendations, including their
19 individual demographic information. We have similar sets of
20 reports for the Republicans and for those Applicants who are not
21 affiliated with either major party.

22 Second, as you know, I have provided you a memo
23 containing several suggested interview questions and four
24 proposed interview schedules. As you indicated, Ms. Spano, the
25 Bureau is working to develop an automated interview scheduling

1 system whereby Applicants could log in on a particular date and
2 time and select the interview day and time that works best for
3 their schedule. And, in order to finalize that system and test
4 it before we allow applicants to sign-up, the Bureau needs your
5 final decision regarding the interview schedule that you would
6 like to use, and so, as you alluded, I am recommending that
7 before the end of the day today, you decide on that issue. I
8 know it requires you to jump ahead, but it is really important
9 for staff to be able to get started on working out the
10 programming on that issue.

11 Additionally, as you are aware, I provided you with a
12 public comment that we received from the Asian Pacific American
13 Legal Center, the NALEO, MALDF, and the Greenlining Institute. I
14 believe Diane has made that, or will make that available at the
15 back of the room. And with that, my report is concluded.
16 Diane, do you mind sharing the reports? At this point in time,
17 Diane will make those reports available at the back of the room
18 and Bureau staff may attempt to upload them onto the Internet,
19 and some of those people who are viewing remotely can see what
20 you see.

21 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, Stephanie.

22 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you, Counsel. Mary, Nasir, do you
23 have any questions or comments for Counsel right now?

24 MS. CAMACHO: No, I do not.

25 MR. AHMADI: No, I do not have any questions, but I

1 have a proposal, perhaps. This is the first time we are looking
2 at these reports and there is a lot of detail here. I think, if
3 you would agree, maybe it is time to take a break maybe, to take
4 a look at all these reports. Or we can take other comments
5 before the break?

6 CHAIR SPANO: I agree. We should take public comments
7 before we recess. What do you think, Mary?

8 MS. CAMACHO: Yes, I agree. We can take public
9 comments before we recess.

10 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, is there any public comment on the
11 reports that were just disseminated to us and available in the
12 back of the room?

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Well, or also, I mean, this is
14 really an opportunity for the public to make a pitch for any
15 Applicants that they feel strongly about, or do not feel
16 strongly about, so that you can review it and consider those
17 thoughts before you go back and make decisions.

18 CHAIR SPANO: That is a good idea.

19 MR. WRIGHT: May I?

20 MR. AHMADI: Please.

21 CHAIR SPANO: Sure. Please state your name for the
22 record.

23 MR. WRIGHT: These are copies.

24 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Thank you. Did you want the
25 disk?

1 MR. WRIGHT: Pardon? The copies are on the disk,
2 PDFs, okay? In case you want to print them for other people.

3 Good morning, I am Jim Wright, a voter from San Jose.
4 I, too, have been going through an analysis of the 314 remaining
5 members, and I found a couple of things that I thought should be
6 brought to your attention. If you remember at the last meeting,
7 I made an impassioned plea that we spend a little time balancing
8 the population of candidates against the population of people in
9 California. And I found a few things that just might be
10 important in this case.

11 The reports that you have in front of you that I
12 produced, there are five of them, they have a number, a
13 watermark on the page, which identifies which page I am
14 referring to, so we are looking at No. 1 at the present time.
15 This is a list of two ladies that I found, who have been
16 recommended in the past by one or more of you folks. They are
17 both homemakers and unique in the population in that regard. I
18 feel very strongly that these two ladies should be given every
19 chance to become members of the Commission. A homemaker is a
20 role that a lot of ladies are not taking these days, but there
21 are a lot of them in the State of California who are simply stay
22 at home moms. And they have a unique point of view, and I
23 believe that that should be represented on the Commission.

24 The second report is a list of individuals remaining
25 on your list who did not say they had any college degree.

1 Again, this is a segment of the population representative of the
2 segment of the population that is a little different from the
3 rest of the candidates. Did you realize, for example, that
4 among the 314, 96 percent of those candidates have a college
5 degree? That is way beyond what we see in the general
6 population. And again, among this list of 13 individuals, I
7 think it would be very nice if we found a way to retain maybe
8 half of them into the 120, maybe have of those into the 60.
9 They do represent a skill base that is a non-college skill base,
10 a couple of these individuals have technical school degrees, but
11 they are not really college degrees, they are Joe Plumber, okay?
12 They are the independent people and just as smart as the rest of
13 us, believe me.

14 Number three, I was looking for a way of identifying
15 younger people to ensure that the folks that are going to
16 inherit this mess from us have a chance to speak up on how the
17 system is going to work in the future. Because the birth date
18 and age are redacted on the Website, I could not use that as a
19 guide, so the guide I used was to look at the date and year in
20 which they achieved their Bachelor's Degree. This says that
21 they are probably somewhere between 22 and 30-years-old, okay?
22 And there are nine people on this list. It would be interesting
23 to see to the possibility of including these folks at least in
24 the pool of 120 and some of them, I hope, would work their way
25 into the pool of 60. There are perhaps half the population in

1 California, maybe more, that do not have college degrees, there
2 are many that do have college degrees, but the young folks are
3 the ones, as I say, who are going to inherit the mess that we
4 are going to leave them, and I think they should have a voice.
5 So, if these are truly folks that are young, and you have access
6 to their birth date, then maybe this is part of a list you ought
7 to retain.

8 Let's move on to No. 4. This one contains 18
9 individuals. And in looking through their employment history,
10 their college experience, and various other factors that I found
11 on the website, each and every one of those had a problem that I
12 could see, and in all but one case, the problem is simply that
13 they have possible contact with the Legislature, either they
14 know Legislators personally, or are known by Legislators, it is
15 hard to determine something like this, but the evidence that I
16 see on the Website points me in that direction, says that there
17 is a possibility they could be influenced once they are on the
18 Commission by their possible contacts with the Legislature. The
19 one individual who is not really in that mode is an individual
20 who runs a company supplying voter information. Now, as such,
21 that does not bother me very much until I see that he was
22 actively involved as a Campaign Manager for a candidate for the
23 Legislature in the '70s, and was also Chairman of the Political
24 party in his county in the '70s, now, that is way back, past
25 history. But once you make those inroads, you are getting on

1 like that, he is probably known somewhere in the organization.
2 If you have any questions, please interrupt me at any time,
3 okay?

4 The last list, No. 5, is really the most difficult
5 one. Among the 314 candidates, 21 percent of them have Juris
6 Doctorate Degrees, 21 percent, that is a fifth. And I believe
7 that is top-heavy. Many of these folks are attorneys, counsel,
8 something like that, they are ambitious people, generally,
9 people who frequently seek to become a member of the
10 Legislature, among other things, and not that we should
11 eliminate people on that list completely, but if it was more
12 representative of the general population, at perhaps 5 percent,
13 might be more reasonable. So I suggest you look at these folks
14 very carefully and decide whether they really do need to
15 continue in the pool. Do you have any questions?

16 CHAIR SPANO: No, thank you. Thank you for your
17 comment.

18 MS. KOPELL: Good morning. I am Malka Kopell from
19 California Forward and we submitted a letter to you earlier this
20 week and I am going to read from it, but I have copies if you
21 need it.

22 MR. AHMADI: We got it.

23 CHAIR SPANO: Actually, the Panel did have a chance to
24 review this earlier, so for the sake of allowing other people to
25 speak, I was wondering if you have anything further to add to

1 your letter that you would like to share with us today.

2 MS. KOPELL: No, I have nothing else to add.

3 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, I would not mind you summarizing
4 it for me, that would be helpful to the public.

5 MS. KOPELL: Sure. We want to make the point about
6 the diversity of the Commission, that it is important for the
7 public to trust the Redistricting Commission, that it be diverse
8 as the State of California, that Proposition 11 has required
9 that, particularly, that we are concerned that these sub-pools
10 be diverse, as well, particularly because even through all the
11 stages, when the eight choose the final six, they need to be
12 able to draw from sub-pools that are diverse to make their final
13 decisions. And, in our analysis of the sub-pools as they stand
14 for the 314, we are concerned about two particular issues, one
15 is the proportion of Latinos in all three sub-pools is low, and
16 second, that the proportion of women, particularly in the
17 Republican sub-pool, is also low. Thank you.

18 MR. AHAMADI: Thank you very much.

19 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you for your comment.

20 MS. GARCIA: Hi, good morning. I am Astrid Garcia
21 with the NALEO Educational Fund, and you received the joint
22 letter, I am also speaking on behalf of the Asian Pacific
23 American Legal Center, MALDEF, and the Greenlining Institute,
24 and you have our letter before you. But just to summarize
25 points that are important for us, that we would like the panel

1 to continue considering as they look at the Applicant pools is,
2 as California Forward just mentioned, we are concerned with the
3 overall diversity in the entire applicant pool, so just by way
4 of example, the point on Latinos, Latinos represent 36.6 percent
5 of California's population, 23 percent of registered voters, but
6 only 14.3 percent of the Applicant pool, so I just used that as
7 an illustration of the challenge that is before you.

8 The next point we would like to also underline is the
9 diversity among the Republican pool, and also in the other pool,
10 so the pool not registered as a Republican or Democrat, and
11 specifically in that pool, the Democratic pool is 54.8 percent
12 non-white, the other pool is 34.9 percent non-white, and the
13 Republican pool is only 22.1 percent non-white, so we would like
14 the Panel to continue considering diversity in the Republican
15 and the other pool, but also still obviously keeping diversity
16 in mind as you look at the Democratic pool, as well.

17 Again, another point was brought up and, just by way
18 of example, again, the Democratic pool is 47 percent female, the
19 other pool is 39.5 percent female, and the Republican pool is
20 only 29.2 percent female, so we recognize that these are
21 challenges that you are already aware of, we just want to
22 underscore the importance of diversity to our organizations, and
23 also as required by the law. So we thank you for the work that
24 you have done in considering at each of the public meetings, I
25 know that you have discussed the importance of diversity, and we

1 just again want to underscore those points, and wish you the
2 best of luck as you continue with your process. Thank you.

3 MR. AHMADI: Thanks, Ms. Garcia.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Is there any further public comment at
5 this time? Okay, well, Mary and Nasir, since you both are
6 agreeable to a break or a recess, should be recess for about 45
7 minutes?

8 MR. AHMADI: Sure.

9 MS. CAMACHO: I think that is adequate.

10 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

11 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: What time is it, here? Why
12 don't you return at 11:00?

13 CHAIR SPANO: Eleven. Okay, we will recess until
14 11:00.

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

16 (Off the record at 10:15 a.m.)

17 (Back on the record at 11:05 a.m.)

18 CHAIR SPANO: It is around 11:05. Well, we have had a
19 chance to review the reports that Counsel has provided us. Are
20 there any observations that you would like to make, Nasir, or
21 Mary?

22 MR. AHMADI: Yes. If I may start?

23 CHAIR SPANO: Sure.

24 MR. AHMADI: As much as I could have given the half
25 hour or 40 minutes that I had, I looked at the details of the

1 reports that suggests or that lists the 142 Applicants who did
2 not receive any favorable recommendation from any Panel members.
3 In my own independent review of all the applications, in the
4 decision that I made to bring to focus on 40 of the most
5 qualified Applicants, none of those items -- or none of those
6 Applicants, excuse me - were included in this list of three no's
7 or three unfavorable recommendations. So, for that reason, I
8 have no objection or disagreement with any individual who is
9 listed in this list of 142 Applicants who did not receive any
10 favorable vote.

11 MS. CAMACHO: Also, I did take a look at the three
12 votes, the three unfavorable votes, and I did not see any
13 additional Applicants that I did not feel should not be there,
14 on my part.

15 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, I, too, when I reviewed this
16 report, I also felt confident that these candidates that
17 received an unfavorable recommendation by all three of us were
18 not as competitive as those that we left in.

19 MS. CAMACHO: I also wanted to say that this was
20 really difficult. I could not believe with these 314 how
21 qualified each and every one was, and what they brought to the
22 table, so it was really difficult to get to these, to narrow
23 this pool down. I just wanted to make that comment, it has been
24 tougher and tougher each time.

25 MR. AHMADI: Madam Chair, if I may interrupt for a

1 second, I think I forgot to introduce my assistant here, so I
2 think we should do that so the public knows who they are. Lynne
3 Reich has been my assistant since the beginning of this process
4 and she is a great help to me. She is there to help me in terms
5 of the administrative processes and procedure, and helping me
6 keep track of things and reminding me of the requirements that
7 we have. She has been great on that. And, of course, the
8 decision has been mine, and that is my responsibility, to make
9 the final decisions, but she has been a great help for me to
10 keep track of things, so, Lynne Reich, it is a pleasure to be
11 here with you.

12 CHAIR SPANO: I apologize, I wanted to actually make a
13 point to say that, at this point, now that we are going to
14 discuss candidates, or any other pool, and today we did have our
15 assistants with us to manage our materials for us as we talk and
16 discuss the Applicants further.

17 MS. CAMACHO: I would like to introduce you to my
18 assistant. He is Bob La Liberte, he has been very helpful and
19 instrumental in helping me organize and keep me focused, and
20 ensure that I was kept on tasks.

21 CHAIR SPANO: I guess I should introduce mine.
22 I forgot again, sorry, Raul. This is Raul Villanueva, he
23 has been assisting me all the way up to this point and is
24 continuing to do a great job for me. So, this is Raul.
25 Well, now that we had a chance to review the reports, I

1 think we should - I will move that we eliminate from the
2 Applicant pool all those Applicants whose names appear on
3 the report entitled "142 Applicants Who Did Not Receive a
4 Favorable Recommendation From Any Panelist."

5 MR. AHMADI: I second that.

6 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you. All in favor?

7 (Ayes.) All opposed?

8 MR. AHMADI: Excuse me, Madam Chair, I am sorry,
9 I heard something about public comments review?

10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You are welcome to take
11 public - you have taken public comment on the Applicants,
12 if you want to hear one more time from the public, you
13 certainly may.

14 MR. AHMADI: Okay.

15 CHAIR SPANO: Would the public like to make
16 further public comment? You have a couple? Okay.

17 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Do you want to go ahead
18 and withdraw your motion? Or do you want to confine
19 comments to the pending motion?

20 CHAIR SPANO: I would propose that we confine
21 comments to the pending motion at this time.

22 MR. AHMADI: I agree.

23 MR. PACHECO: Thank you, I will be brief. David
24 Pacheco with the other AARP, representing 30.1 million
25 members here in California. I am the State President of

1 AARP. Looking at this list of 142, I just have one - one
2 candidate comes to mind that did not receive any votes,
3 that is a retired professor from University of California,
4 Davis, Adalijiza Riddell Sosa. You have Sosa listed as
5 her middle name, which is actually her maiden name, Sosa
6 Riddell. So, I am just curious that the generic statement
7 that she was not competitive enough, she spent 40 years
8 teaching and founded one of the first Ethnic Studies
9 Programs here in the State of California, a career of
10 Civic education and community engagement, and is not only
11 a Latina, but she is disabled and her disability is not
12 from aging, she has walked with a cane for a number of
13 years. I am just a little taken aback that she did not
14 make the at least one recommendation from the three of
15 you, but you have your own criteria, it just - that one
16 stands out to me in terms of - and I do not know her
17 personally, other than by reputation. I have met her a
18 few years back, she is living now in Southern California,
19 but she is one of the first Latina PhD's in the country.
20 I am a University of California Annuitant and I think I am
21 still functional. I believe she would have been an asset
22 to this group and, for whatever reasons that the three
23 individuals did not find her competitive, so I just bring
24 that to your attention. I do not know your individual
25 criteria, I am sure you are looking at everything very

1 carefully, and as fairly, and as transparently, as you
2 can, but that one just kind of stands out to me.

3 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you.

4 MR. PACHECO: And your criteria remains your
5 own, and not up for discussion?

6 MR. AHMADI: Well, if I can - Madam Chair?

7 CHAIR SPANO: Yes, please.

8 MR. AHMADI: Thank you so much for the comment.

9 I just wanted to assure you that the criteria that we
10 follow is from the regulations, and as my colleagues
11 stated earlier, the decisions that we have been making are
12 extremely difficult. There is absolutely no doubt that
13 this individual has the talent and the professional and
14 personal abilities to do this job, but the process that we
15 have been following has been rigorous, in terms of being
16 consistent, to apply the same criteria that is in the law,
17 and try to determine the most qualified Applicants. And
18 in the process of making those decisions, as you would
19 probably expect, some of these talents will have to be
20 subject to those difficult decisions and, by all means,
21 you know, I appreciate that comment, but as far as I
22 remember the details, although I do not have the material
23 with me, I do not think this individual was non-affiliated
24 with any party. I believe this was -

25 MR. PACHECO: She was a registered Democrat.

1 MR. AHMADI: This was a Democrat, correct. So
2 since today we are preparing to discuss the others, but
3 regardless, I just wanted to assure you that the process
4 we followed has considered all those criteria.

5 MR. PACHECO: All right, I appreciate that and
6 my larger goal is, as I said at the last meeting, that the
7 chronologically gifted be included in your demographics
8 because that transcends women, minorities, what have you,
9 older Americans have a wealth of talent to offer to this,
10 it could almost be a double count in terms of trying to
11 have a diverse and talented Commission.

12 MR. AHMADI: We will do our best. Thank you,
13 sir.

14 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you. Is there any further
15 public comment at this time? Seeing that there is no
16 further comment -

17 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We have a motion that has
18 been seconded. I wanted to take you back to where you
19 were before you had public comment.

20 CHAIR SPANO: How about if I repeat the motion?

21 MR. AHMADI: That sounds good.

22 CHAIR SPANO: Just for clarification.

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: How about if I repeat the
24 motion? The pending motion that has been seconded is to
25 remove from the Applicant pool all Applicants whose names

1 appear on the List of the Report prepared by Counsel,
2 entitled "142 Applicants Who Did Not Receive a Favorable
3 Recommendation From Any Panelist." That motion has been
4 seconded and you can vote if you wish to.

5 CHAIR SPANO: All in favor, say aye.

6 (Ayes.) All opposed?

7 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Ms. Spano, are you -

8 CHAIR SPANO: Aye.

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I believe there is no
10 opposition.

11 CHAIR SPANO: No opposition.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: The motion is carried.

13 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

14 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. All right, let's see.
15 Let's get started on the pool of Others. Based on the
16 reports we have received today, we have 25 Applicants not
17 affiliated with either party, who received three favorable
18 recommendations. I previously suggested that we begin our
19 deliberations by placing these Applicants in the tentative
20 pool of 40. If that is still agreeable, then we have -

21 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You do have 25 in the
22 tentative pool.

23 CHAIR SPANO: We have 25 in the tentative pool,
24 but 15 remaining to discuss.

25 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Correct.

1 CHAIR SPANO: So before we begin our discussion,
2 I have a few ideas that I think we should consider. I
3 feel it is important for each of us to be heard, and to
4 have an opportunity to present Applicants for
5 consideration; as such, it would be great if we could just
6 take turns, each suggesting one Applicant at a time for
7 consideration to be interviewed. Also, once we have a
8 preliminary pool of about 40 to 45 Applicants, I suggest
9 that we stop and take a break to consider the pool and
10 determine what the additional changes need to be made
11 before we further continue.

12 MR. AHMADI: Sounds good.

13 CHAIR SPANO: Is this agreeable?

14 MS. CAMACHO: That is agreeable.

15 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

16 CHAIR SPANO: Would either of you like to bring
17 up an Applicant?

18 MS. CAMACHO: Yes, I do. Let me get to them. I
19 would like to bring Gregory Francis forward to the
20 tentative pool. What I did see with this individual is
21 their involvement in so many charities. He also - he is
22 familiar with public speaking, he is fluent in Spanish,
23 and he has an intermediate level of proficiency in
24 Mandarin and Japanese -

25 MR. AHMADI: Mary, I am sorry, could you please

1 repeat the name?

2 MS. CAMACHO: Oh, sorry, it was Gregory Francis,
3 F-r-a-n-c-i-s. Do you want me to wait?

4 MR. AHMADI: One second, yes, please.

5 MS. CAMACHO: Okay.

6 MR. AHMADI: Okay, thank you. I am ready.

7 MS. CAMACHO: Okay. I was also pretty impressed
8 that he attended for his Masters a University in Ecuador
9 and he wrote his Masters thesis in Spanish, so I would
10 like to put this individual in our tentative pool to
11 interview.

12 MR. AHMADI: I remember this application, when I
13 reviewed it, my initial - going back a few months, I
14 guess, my initial recommendation on this Applicant was to
15 recommend, so I was happy with the qualifications that I
16 read from the Applicant material, but as I stated earlier,
17 when we went to the next stage, when we were comparing to
18 the most qualified, so there were some values that
19 probably caused me some concerns, and that is why I said -
20 that was the reason why I probably said no to this
21 individual, not probably, but it was the reason. But, you
22 know, you raise some good points about this Applicant, so
23 I will be happy to reconsider that.

24 MS. CAMACHO: Kerri?

25 CHAIR SPANO: Yes, I reviewed this Applicant and

1 I initially thought he could bring a lot of diversity to
2 the Commission. He is both - his background is in both
3 Latin America and Asia, so had the opportunity to work
4 with ethnically diverse backgrounds, he is open-minded, he
5 is a good listener, these are qualities in a Commissioner
6 that I feel are very important. He is involved in a
7 variety of community service events, has organized a few
8 of them, let's see what else, I agree with both of you
9 that - I believe he has got strengths that he can offer
10 the Commission that we may want to consider placing in the
11 tentative pool of 40.

12 MS. CAMACHO: Okay.

13 MR. AHMADI: I think that, yes. So I think it
14 is my turn now?

15 CHAIR SPANO: Sure.

16 MR. AHMADI: Okay, I would like to introduce an
17 Applicant whose name is Peggy Lopez. And the Applicant
18 number is 11239. So, I voted for Peggy because she has,
19 in my opinion, the abilities and the skills to do the job
20 of the Commission as successful as could possibly be
21 accomplished. One thing that strikes me about this
22 Applicant is that she went back to school at the age of
23 50, and not only did she get a Bachelor's Degree, but also
24 a Doctorate in Judicial. From the employment history, it
25 appears that she has a vast knowledge of California

1 population and demographics. I believe that this would be
2 a good addition to the pool in terms of, you know,
3 individuals who relate to various - since she has been
4 through several different jobs in her life, I believe she
5 can relate to many different backgrounds and people in
6 California. So, for that reason, I would like to have
7 this one back in the pool.

8 MS. CAMACHO: Originally when I was looking at
9 Peggy Lopez's application, it concerned me just a little
10 bit about the jobs, but listening to you saying, you know,
11 in thinking about this will bring various insights and
12 different experiences into this pool, I have to say I
13 agree because she also, what she is bringing in is also,
14 you know, she was a truck driver, she worked for
15 nonprofits, so I think that is kind of a good mix for our
16 Commission, and I agree that we should probably put her on
17 our tentative list to interview.

18 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, I am glad to hear that.

19 CHAIR SPANO: I agree with both of you. When I
20 reviewed this Applicant, I believe she really exhibited
21 strong outreach and that tells me that she would be an
22 excellent candidate for listening to communities of
23 interest. I think she also mentions that she has
24 mediating experience; that tells me that she is impartial,
25 and that she has experience listening to both sides. She

1 also has experience with Boards, budgets, so she could
2 probably be one that would actually be familiar in
3 administering the Commission, also. This candidate has
4 enough strengths to be considered to remain in the
5 tentative pool of 40.

6 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

7 CHAIR SPANO: I guess that brings it to me. I
8 would like to discuss the next Applicant, Tamina Alon.
9 This candidate has direct experience with applied research
10 and redistricting and applying the Voters Rights Act, and
11 drawing maps, and working with diverse groups and
12 individuals. Her letters of recommendation also support
13 her strengths. I believe she is a very strong candidate,
14 in my opinion, one that had direct relevant experience
15 that she can apply to the Commission work.

16 MR. AHMADI: Yeah, I believe she had an
17 internship at the Berkeley School of Law, she has had
18 experience with GIS, the mapping systems and all that, and
19 then I am glad that you mentioned that because she was
20 next on my list, actually, so I agree with you.

21 MS. CAMACHO: What concerned me just a little
22 bit was I did not see a large community involvement in her
23 application. But I know that she was a note taker for the
24 deaf students and I am willing to put her in the tentative
25 pool to interview because my only concern that I had was I

1 was wanting to see a little bit more community
2 involvement, but she did have the note taker for deaf
3 students, so that kind of gives a little bit of flavor
4 there.

5 CHAIR SPANO: And I understand your concern.
6 And also want to just point out that this Applicant does
7 have a commitment to service in her ability to work well
8 with diverse groups and individuals, and I think we really
9 need a candidate that can exhibit that, so I think it is a
10 positive strength. It should be highlighted.

11 MR. AHMADI: I agree.

12 CHAIR SPANO: So at this point, it sounds like
13 we are all in agreement maybe that we should move this
14 candidate forward to the tentative pool of 40?

15 MR. AHMADI: Sure.

16 CHAIR SPANO: Mary, did you have another
17 candidate you would like to discuss?

18 MS. CAMACHO: Yes, I did. It is Jerry Turem.

19 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Jerry Turem.

20 MS. CAMACHO: Oh, it is Jerry, sorry.

21 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It is okay, there was a
22 request to repeat it. Just out of curiosity, are you all
23 having trouble hearing the panelists? Do we need to turn
24 it up a little bit? Okay, we will see if we can get
25 somebody in to adjust the sound system a little bit.

1 MS. CAMACHO: If you have a hard time listening
2 to me, let me know, because I can talk a lot louder.
3 Good? A little bit more. Is that good? Okay. I feel
4 that this applicant would bring a perspective from the
5 rural community. You know, he has lived in cities,
6 suburbs, and now lives in a rural county, which is Amador
7 County in Plymouth, and he can kind of give that
8 perspective of, in California, in this rural community,
9 but he still understands the suburbs and the cities. He
10 also was the Federal Senior Executive, he established the
11 first Hispanic Initiative, bringing in to Government, and
12 he was also good analytical skills, so I would like to put
13 him on our list of our tentative applicants for
14 interviews.

15 MR. AHMADI: I totally agree, Mary. This
16 individual was in my list of one of the 40, so obviously
17 we are in agreement on the qualifications.

18 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, this is a pretty well
19 rounded candidate, I think, that could provide diversity,
20 geography diversity. He understands the seriousness and
21 the responsibilities of Commission work. Many years ago,
22 he was a member of the National Association of Social
23 Workers, the San Francisco Chapter, so he has knowledge of
24 that are and those people, also. He has performed
25 vocational rehabilitation, professional conferences, he

1 has had extensive planning exercises sitting out for
2 timeframes and benchmarks for conflicts processes for
3 multi-year grant and contract recipients, and so this
4 person may be extremely aware of the need to conduct
5 Commission work in the eight and a half months and
6 deadlines, and committee hearing deadlines. I do like
7 this candidate, I would like to consider him to be put in
8 the pool for further consideration.

9 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

10 CHAIR SPANO: Nasir, do you have another
11 candidate that you would like to discuss?

12 MR. AHMADI: Yes, I do have another candidate.
13 This individual, the Applicant's name is Vincent
14 Casalaina.

15 MS. CAMACHO: Could you repeat that last name,
16 Nasir, please? Thank you.

17 MR. AHMADI: I hope I can read this correctly,
18 if I cannot, I apologize, it is C-a-s-a-l-a-i-n-a,
19 Casalaina. The first name is Vincent. So I have voted
20 for Vincent since the beginning, as one of my favorable
21 candidates. In my initial take on the qualifications,
22 when we looked at the minimum qualifications, this
23 individual had excellent abilities to be able to do the
24 job of the Commission as successful as possible. And when
25 we looked at the Applicant material, collectively, I still

1 voted as favorable for this individual. This individual
2 has activities in Commissions, as a member of the Berkeley
3 Housing Advisory Commission, that is something for me, as
4 a reminder to remember to pick up details on this
5 Application. So, when I look at letters of
6 recommendation, public comments, and other Applicant
7 material, it further convinced me that I will be very
8 comfortable having this individual in one of the 40 that I
9 would like to interview. So, I would like to suggest that
10 we should add Vincent Casalaina in the pool of 40.

11 CHAIR SPANO: Mary, thoughts on this candidate?

12 MS. CAMACHO: I agree with Nasir, I thought he
13 has some Board experience, so that will help in the sense
14 of being able to be comfortable within this type of
15 situation that we are in, also, he is very involved in his
16 community, he has a diverse family, so I think that will
17 kind of help understand when he goes out and talks to the
18 community, so I feel that those are very good qualities.
19 And one other thing is he has a positive outlook. Reading
20 his application, you just - you just get this upbeat
21 attitude, and I think that is very important, of always
22 having a positive attitude.

23 CHAIR SPANO: I liked this candidate also, he is
24 a strong candidate. His analytical skills are
25 demonstrated with his committee experience. He had a

1 great example of being a President of a neighborhood
2 council and how he describes being impartial. In his
3 diversity response, he also presented a good understanding
4 of the Commission work and the mission of the Commission.
5 He has chaired the Housing Advisory Committee in Berkeley
6 and has completed a range of technical research projects
7 related to transportation, so that is another issue that
8 is probably very strong. He has a career - lots of career
9 work in multi-media, and he has an architectural
10 background, which I found interesting. I do like this
11 candidate and I think we should consider moving him
12 forward in the tentative pool of 40.

13 MR. AHMADI: Thank you so much.

14 CHAIR SPANO: Well, I would like to discuss the
15 next Applicant to bring forward, Stephen Allen, A-l-l-e-n.
16 This candidate, I was really impressed with this
17 candidate. He is also from Plumas, they are well
18 represented area! So, his responses, I believe, were all
19 in the context of the responsibility and the needs of the
20 Commission. He has redistricting experience, three times
21 with the Board of Supervisor's Districts, so he has very
22 involved and direct relevant experience towards the duties
23 charged before us. He has open meeting experience, which
24 is directly relevant also, has experience with public
25 boards, and has worked with voters and polling places. I

1 think he sufficiently answered all the questions with a
2 lot of detail, I particularly found his redistricting of
3 the Plumas County Board of Supervisor Districts in '81 and
4 '91, and 2000 directly relevant and very strong for the
5 Commission. Mary, what did you think?

6 MS. CAMACHO: I agree with you. He was one of
7 my 40 that I was bringing forward and what really caught
8 my eye was the prior redistricting experience he had for
9 Plumas County, and this was not just one time, but three
10 times that he did do this. This, I think, would be very
11 relevant for one of the Commissioners, and I agree that -
12 I feel that he should be moved to our tentative pool of
13 Applicants.

14 CHAIR SPANO: Nasir?

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you. You raise good points,
16 Kerri, and because this individual was not one of my 40,
17 obviously, because I had said no to - I do not have the
18 details with me, but what you just discussed, and what
19 Mary has just suggested, it is impressive. I believe,
20 since the two of you would like to have this individual, I
21 do not mind to take a second look at the application and
22 have him in the pool.

23 CHAIR SPANO: Well, then, you know, I do want to
24 bring something since you do not have it, I just want to
25 say that this candidate also ran the State Census Data

1 Center in Plumas County, so he is very familiar.

2 MR. AHMADI: That is great.

3 CHAIR SPANO: Yeah. So at this point, I believe
4 we should moving this Applicant to the tentative pool of
5 40, also.

6 MR. AHMADI: I believe so.

7 CHAIR SPANO: Mary.

8 MS. CAMACHO: I would like to have us consider -
9 hopefully I am going to say her name correctly, Velveth
10 Schmitz. I liked this Applicant because she had some
11 committee experience, and that would really help. She has
12 a lot of volunteer activity, she is a first generation
13 immigrant. She has worked with women, with homeless
14 women, and so she has this breadth of experience that I
15 think would be very well received in the Commission.

16 CHAIR SPANO: I agree, Mary. I see that this
17 candidate - I recognize that she was a stay at home mom
18 with a Poly Sci degree and had a lot of experience - all
19 volunteer experience, that says a lot about her, and her
20 dedication to commit to other people other than her
21 family. She studied Communities of Interest in college.
22 I believe she was a Parks Commissioner, also. In her
23 analytical skills, she described her volunteer
24 commissioner - her parks activities, and she built
25 consensus among committees and citizens to maintain the

1 environment for a city. And so, I thought that was a very
2 good strength of Ms. Schmitz. Nasir, did you have any
3 observations?

4 MR. AHMADI: Sure, thank you. This was another
5 individual who was not in my list of 140, but again, for
6 that reason, I do not have the application detail with me,
7 but I do remember this individual and I do remember the
8 qualifications that she brings, obviously, as mentioned
9 before, the decisions are based on who is perceived as
10 being the most qualified, so I do not remember any
11 specific details as to why I might have said no to this
12 individual, but I am sure that it is about when I compared
13 to the rest of the pool, I probably have some concerns
14 about some of the qualifications. But now that I hear,
15 again, from both of you, the qualifications and you are
16 highlighting very very important aspects of attributes
17 that makes an individual successful for the Commission;
18 again, I would like to have the chance to reassess and
19 look at this application one more time, so for that
20 reason, I would like to add them back into the pool of
21 140.

22 CHAIR SPANO: Sounds great. I should add,
23 Nasir, when you look at this candidate further, she has
24 also been a business owner, and she has had to create a
25 corporation from her idea, she states this in her - her

1 idea to a venture, and I think that says a lot about a
2 person's commitment and dedication, which we need for
3 Commission work.

4 MR. AHMADI: Definitely, I agree.

5 CHAIR SPANO: I agree that this person should be
6 moved into the application pool.

7 MR. AHMADI: Is it my turn now?

8 CHAIR SPANO: I believe it is.

9 MR. AHMADI: Thank you. I would like to suggest
10 that we should bring this other Applicant back to the
11 pool, first name is Vylma, last name is Ortiz. My
12 assessment of her qualifications and general abilities to
13 be successful at the Commission has been very good and
14 excellent. When I looked at the details on the Applicant,
15 it further convinced me that this will be a good addition
16 back to the pool. The individual has a lot of community
17 involvement, she has been in the steering committee for
18 California Coalition for Civil Rights, and I respect that,
19 of course. So, collectively, when I look at the material
20 here, to me, this individual was one of my 40 applicants
21 that I was hoping to have in the pool of applicants that
22 we would like to interview. Examples provided to describe
23 not only understanding, but demonstration of certain
24 qualities or qualifications impressed me. And when you
25 look at the collective material on this individual, it

1 just came through as an individual who is excited about
2 the work of the Commission. And I believe there were
3 certain values in knowing that individuals do this because
4 they have a passion for doing a good job on the
5 Commission. So, when you add all the technical qualities
6 or the soft qualities that I gathered from the Applicant
7 material, I would be honored if you guys add this
8 individual back into the pool, so that we can reassess the
9 qualifications.

10 MS. CAMACHO: When I initially looked at this
11 application, I had an initial reservation about this
12 Applicant's work history, so - but after listening to what
13 you have said, I am willing to put her in the tentative
14 pool to interview.

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, Mary. I appreciate
16 that.

17 CHAIR SPANO: I like this candidate. I think
18 she adds diversity to the pool, she is a social activist
19 with a focus on the justice criminal system for juveniles,
20 so she can identify with a lot of youth since she was
21 associated with that in the community. I believe she has
22 very good strengths that we have not seen yet in a
23 candidate. In impartiality, she has great examples as a
24 public defender, which demonstrates her integrity, also.
25 In her activities section, she is active in the Bay Area

1 Puerto Rican Culture Group and discussion of the diversity
2 with Latinos, so she can identify with that group closely.
3 She was also the California Director of Youth Build, 24
4 sites serving at-risk youth, and so I think that is a very
5 good quality to have with the problems that could be
6 occurring in certain counties and regions and
7 neighborhoods in the State of California. So, I agree
8 that we should move this candidate forward in the
9 tentative pool of 40.

10 MR. AHMADI: I would like to.

11 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. I would like to discuss and
12 bring forward candidate Thais Armenta.

13 MR. AHMADI: I am sorry, what was the name?

14 CHAIR SPANO: Thais Armenta, A-r-m-e-n-t-a.

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

16 MS. CAMACHO: Okay.

17 CHAIR SPANO: This candidate has offered other
18 skills and abilities and talents that I thought were
19 beneficial for commission work. She is an accounts
20 manager at Revell Communications, she is a working soccer
21 mom, she is good at dealing with different opposing
22 groups, and feels very comfortable discussing different
23 issues and opposing issues, she networks between opposing
24 teams, she has been successful for fundraisers, for her
25 son's water polo team, she has got great communities of

1 interest, and pretty good analytical skills, and she
2 offers great administrative skills that could benefit the
3 Commission in helping to get organized and set up. Nasir?

4 MR. AHMADI: I agree. I mean, this is an
5 individual that I did not have in my initial list of 40,
6 but after hearing from you and also looking at the details
7 as far as I can remember, I think I was on the fence with
8 this one, to be honest, and I was comparing with other
9 qualified individuals in the entire pool. And maybe the
10 reason why I wanted to keep her out of my initial pool was
11 some concerns maybe that I had about the experience, but
12 that is something that, as you stated, you know, it brings
13 some positive skills and positive addition to the
14 Commission, as a whole. So I am going to agree with you
15 and bring her back in so we can reassess the Applicant.

16 MS. CAMACHO: With this Applicant, I just had a
17 little concern with the analytical skills that I saw that
18 she wrote in here, but when you are bringing up these life
19 experiences that she would bring to the Commission, I
20 think those are very relevant, and I agree, I think we
21 should put her in the tentative list for interviewing.

22 CHAIR SPANO: Great.

23 MS. CAMACHO: I would like for us to consider
24 Linda Civitello.

25 MR. AHMADI: What was the last name again?

1 MS. CAMACHO: Civitello, C-i-v-i-t-e-l-l-o.

2 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, got it.

3 MS. CAMACHO: I feel that she brings a lot - she
4 would bring a lot to the Commission. She is familiar with
5 public speaking, she has lived throughout California, just
6 not the northern part, but also the southern part. She is
7 a CEO for a nonprofit, which says Breathe California,
8 Golden Gate Public Health Partnership. She has worked
9 with a board in her current employment, so she kind of
10 understands the processes and what would be required at
11 the Commission, and this was brought up in one of her
12 letters of recommendation. So, I would like to have her
13 considered.

14 MR. AHMADI: I guess I agree with you, Mary,
15 this is one of my top 40 in my current list, so without
16 going into further detail, I agree with you that there are
17 certain qualifications and abilities and skills that this
18 individual brings to the pool, so I would like to keep
19 her.

20 CHAIR SPANO: I would like to say I agree and
21 concur with you, Mary, also Nasir, that this candidate
22 brings a unique public health background, which I have not
23 seen yet, and she has great experience doing outreach to
24 diverse populations in San Francisco. As we all know, San
25 Francisco is very diverse and so it would be particularly

1 helpful with the knowledge and background dealing with
2 people in communities of interest in that area. I think
3 she has strong analytical skills, also. She has strong
4 quantitative and analysis and some committee experience,
5 also. I agree with you, Nasir and Mary, that we should
6 bring this candidate forward for further consideration in
7 the tentative pool of 40.

8 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

9 CHAIR SPANO: Is it my turn? Okay, bear with me
10 while I - Mary, did you bring -- who just last brought
11 that candidate forward?

12 MS. CAMACHO: That was me.

13 CHAIR SPANO: So, Nasir, it is your turn.

14 MR. AHMADI: Sure, thank you. The next
15 individual I had on my 1 of 40 that I had seen as being
16 strong is Matthew Lorono.

17 MS. CAMACHO: Can you say the last name again,
18 Nasir?

19 MR. AHMADI: I am going to spell it. Again, I
20 am sorry if I cannot read it correctly, but it is L-o-r-o-
21 n-o. Lorono. So, again, this is an individual that I
22 have voted as favorable, not only this time, but in the
23 last time, based on my assessment of the qualifications as
24 presented in the application material. My initial thought
25 on this one was, as very good, and she brings some - I am

1 sorry - Matthew brings some good qualities, community
2 involvement listed in the application, non-financial
3 background, the analytical skills impressed me, there is
4 expert analytical skills which, I believe, is very useful
5 for the work of the Commission. And when I looked at the
6 letters of recommendation, good sources and further
7 supports the individual's strengths and ability and skills
8 to be able to successfully function at the Commission.
9 The individual has engineering background and auditing
10 experience and community involvement, and this individual
11 also maintains a Website which discusses issues related to
12 the Applicant's professional expertise, and all that, so
13 when I looked at all the activities that this individual
14 was involved with, and the abilities that are reflected in
15 the application material, I think this individual needs to
16 be in the tentative list of 40, so I would like to propose
17 that we should add this individual back in the pool.

18 MS. CAMACHO: This particular Applicant, my
19 initial concern was that he talked a lot about his
20 computer skills. But, as I am listening to you, you know,
21 he has these other abilities that I am hearing, and also
22 one thing that I did note, that when he was small, his
23 family was homeless, and that brings another perspective
24 to the Commission that I think would be beneficial.

25 MR. AHMADI: Definitely.

1 CHAIR SPANO: I agree. I noticed that he had a
2 lot of technical skills, or computer skills, but I feel
3 that is necessary for the Commission because we have not
4 seen or discussed a candidate that emphasized that type of
5 qualification or characteristic. I also found him to be
6 able to work with commissions and to be a real people
7 person and respectful and aware of other people's needs.
8 I thought he had a good impartiality response, also. And
9 he is a good decision-maker, problem solver, I think those
10 are qualities in a Commissioner that we really feel -- I
11 feel - are relevant. And he listens carefully to opposing
12 arguments between both sides very seriously. So I believe
13 this candidate has the qualifications to remain and
14 strengths to remain in the tentative pool of 40.

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

16 CHAIR SPANO: I would like to bring forward for
17 discussion Applicant Jacquelyn Estrada. This Applicant is
18 - I thought she was a very strong Applicant and candidate
19 for Commission work. She has a unique background as a
20 college textbook editor, so she regularly analyzes a
21 variety of data, statistics, she verifies facts, she makes
22 conflicts information more understandable. I think that
23 is a very relevant qualification and strength that is
24 needed in a Commissioner as they listen to communities of
25 interest, or provide the public with clarification on

1 certain legal issues, or clarification on matters. If we
2 have someone who is a good strong communicator on that
3 Commission, it would be very helpful.

4 MR. AHMADI: Definitely.

5 CHAIR SPANO: She has a solid diversity
6 response. She helps out at one of the nation's largest
7 conventions, Comicon, so she is very aware of adapting to
8 and listening to a variety of interests of diverse
9 population. Mary, Nasir, do you have any comments about
10 this candidate?

11 MS. CAMACHO: My initial concern with this
12 Applicant was I didn't see that she had some involvement
13 with, you know, some volunteer work. What I noticed was
14 that she was dealing with the writing and the comic books,
15 but now that you are bringing in the speaking, and that is
16 going to be a quality that the Applicant or the potential
17 Commissioner should be able to do, they are going to have
18 to be able to talk to people, they are going to have to be
19 able to communicate, and I think that is a very good skill
20 to have. And also, I noticed that she did have some board
21 experience and I think that would be a plus. So, I am
22 willing to put her on the tentative list.

23 MR. AHMADI: And, again, I was on the fence with
24 this one because I initially said it was not in my 140, I
25 do not have all the details with me, but I agree with you

1 that this individual has - I will re-look at this and I
2 will reassess my assessment of the qualifications on this
3 one, so I am okay to put it back in.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, great.

5 MS. CAMACHO: I would like to bring forward for
6 consideration Robert Silva. What I saw in Robert was he
7 is involved in his community, this was noted in one of his
8 public comments. Also, he is a technical expert in data
9 integration and what we heard during our training is we
10 need to also look at various other aspects, you know, to
11 have maybe individuals that brought other skills, computer
12 skills for the Commission, because they are going to be
13 working with these programs and consultants, so they want
14 to make sure that everything is okay. Also, he is a Meals
15 on Wheels volunteer, so he is out there with the people
16 and he is very caring. One thing that I thought was
17 interesting was he is an endurance athlete, and I am
18 going, you know, with this Commission, he is going to be
19 going, going, going, and he is going to have to really
20 have the endurance to get through these eight months, to
21 get this work done, and I think this forethought and
22 dedication that endurance athletes have to have is going
23 to be a credit, so I really would like to have you guys
24 consider him.

25 MR. AHMADI: I agree. Again, this individual

1 was on the fence for me, and the only concern that I had
2 was not a serious concern, but I was looking at the
3 employment history and the gaps in employment, but I was
4 not sure, to be honest. So I am glad that you are
5 bringing him back in, and I agree with that. I think it
6 deserves to have an interview.

7 MS. CAMACHO: And, you know, I did see that
8 also, Nasir, but he graduated in 2007, so very recently,
9 and he did have some job movement prior to going to
10 school, so -

11 MR. AHMADI: Which was understandable, now that
12 you mention it.

13 MS. CAMACHO: I kind of noticed that, yeah, that
14 is what I was thinking.

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

16 CHAIR SPANO: His strength is as an IT
17 specialist for a Unified School District, and he describes
18 his analytical skills in depth, he deals with a variety of
19 projects, dealing with student information systems, he
20 understands how to evaluate and verify the validity data,
21 which is going to be necessary as a Commissioner reviews
22 the voting and census data. Let's see, I believe his
23 strength is also communicating with people as he does his
24 IT work. He has extensive experience dealing and
25 articulating complicated issues and dealing with a

1 difficult, high stress, fast paced situations that are
2 often politically charged in the Oakland Unified School
3 District. I feel that that quality alone is absolutely
4 necessary as the Commissioners go and meet with
5 communities, and discuss maybe contentious arguments when
6 they are listening to opposing issues. So, I believe that
7 this candidate exhibits the qualifications and skills
8 needed for Commission work and I agree that he should be
9 moved forward to the tentative pool of 40.

10 MS. CAMACHO: Thank you.

11 MR. AHMADI: Is it my turn now?

12 MS. CAMACHO: Yes.

13 MR. AHMADI: I am sorry, well, not that I am
14 willing to add anybody else because I had a separate
15 print-out for myself, these are my notes, which list all
16 the individuals that were on the top of my 40, and I am so
17 glad that we have covered almost all of them - almost.
18 So, at this point, I do not want to add anybody else to
19 the pool. I am happy with what we have.

20 MS. CAMACHO: Kerri, would you like to add
21 somebody? Or do you want me to add another? Because
22 there are a few additional -

23 CHAIR SPANO: Go ahead and do that, I am trying
24 to assess which ones I need to probably bring forward
25 further.

1 MS. CAMACHO: Okay. I would like to add for
2 consideration Lacey Holtzen. Lacey is pretty young and I
3 was pretty impressed with all the work that she has been
4 able to do. She has performed community workshops to
5 obtain info and provide info, so I thought that this is
6 very pertinent to a Commission because they are going to
7 be having to go out and to communities of interest and get
8 information. She also grew up in a rural area, and then
9 she moved to a suburb and then also lived in a city, so
10 that kind of brings that perspective.

11 MR. AHMADI: Is it my turn?

12 MS. CAMACHO: Yes, go ahead.

13 MR. AHMADI: Thank you. I had voted yes for
14 this individual in the previous review and I believe I was
15 on the fence on this one, again, she was almost one of my
16 40, but I think she is involved as a transportation
17 planner and very good with demographics. I think it was
18 about eight months or so, so some experience in that area,
19 as well. I would love to have her back in the tentative
20 list to have a chance to interview.

21 MS. CAMACHO: Okay, thank you.

22 CHAIR SPANO: I agree with what you both said.

23 She is a transportation planner. She offers a good

24 response to communities of interest and the diversity.

25 She - her strength, I believe, is she has good experience

1 working in the group decision-making arena, she has got
2 great community experience, technical and analytical. I
3 believe that this candidate has the qualifications and
4 strengths to be moved forward into the tentative pool of
5 40 this time.

6 MS. CAMACHO: Thank you.

7 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Madam Chair, is it
8 possible to take a brief break?

9 CHAIR SPANO: Yeah.

10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Sorry.

11 CHAIR SPANO: No, that is okay.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I mean, I do not know if
13 you want to break for lunch and that could coincide - it
14 is up to you, but it is noon. Yeah, I agree, a brief
15 break. I need 10 minutes.

16 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, let's take - well, should we
17 consider taking a lunch break at this time?

18 MR. AHMADI: Sure.

19 CHAIR SPANO: Do you propose about a half hour?

20 MS. CAMACHO: Yeah, a half hour is good.

21 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, I would say - it is about
22 12:07 right now, so maybe -

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: 12:40?

24 CHAIR SPANO: 12:40 is good. Let's reconvene at
25 12:40.

1 (Recessed at 12:07 p.m.)

2 --oOo--

3 AFTERNOON SESSION

4 12:49 P.M.

5 CHAIR SPANO: Let's continue our discussion.

6 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Just for the record, it's
7 12:49.

8 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. Thank you.

9 Did we finish discussing Holtzen already?

10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Yes, I believe you had
11 her on --

12 CHAIR SPANO: Yes, okay, that's what I thought.

13 And please refresh my memory, who was next in
14 the rotation.

15 MS. CAMACHO: Well, I had mine.

16 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, so Nasir, you may go then
17 next.

18 MR. AHMADI: Sure, I'm ready.

19 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

20 MR. AHMADI: I would like to -- actually, I just
21 want to clarify the statement that I made before lunch,
22 that I said I don't have anybody on my list to add. Over
23 the lunch I looked back at my list, I have two additional
24 individuals, one of which I wanted to add back to the
25 pool.

1 So, this individual that I'd like to have back
2 in the tentative pool of 40 is Michelle DiGuilio-Matz.

3 CHAIR SPANO: What was the last name again,
4 Nasir?

5 MR. AHMADI: DiGuilio-Matz. It's hyphenated, D-
6 i-G-u-i-l-i-o hyphen M-a-t-z.

7 Do we have the applicant number for that name?

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: 18242.

9 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

10 So, for this individual when I looked back at my
11 assessments in the past, since we initially started the
12 review process, I have always said as favorable or rated
13 as favorable this individual, and for obvious reasons.

14 In my assessment I found this individual has
15 being a strong applicant in terms of both minimum
16 qualifications and other skills and attributes that this
17 individual has that I believe will add to the Commission
18 as a whole in terms of positive addition to the
19 Commission's success.

20 This individual has experience with public
21 events, conferences, teaching coordinator. So, overall,
22 without going into the details, unless you have any
23 questions about the details, I think in the interest of
24 efficiency I just want to say I'd love to have this
25 individual back in the pool.

1 MS. CAMACHO: Nasir, I also did like this
2 applicant. I was pretty impressed that she was a female
3 firefighter, I thought --

4 MR. AHMADI: Yes.

5 MS. CAMACHO: -- that kind of showed a lot of
6 initiative. And that she did facilitate community forums,
7 so that would be very applicable experience for the
8 commissioner.

9 She has some board experience and she has strong
10 mapping skills.

11 So, I agree with your wanting to put her in the
12 tentative pool.

13 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, I appreciate that.

14 CHAIR SPANO: I also like this candidate and
15 especially she has a unique background, building
16 consensus, in the Central Valley.

17 She's actually from, represents San Joaquin
18 County, so she has a good handle on the issues in that
19 region and area that I don't believe we have an applicant
20 that has demonstrated that, yet.

21 I'd agree with you, too, Mary, that she has
22 great GIS skills. She has great, very strong analytical
23 skills that she can bring to commission work.

24 She has experience creating the Central Valley
25 Water Council that brought together diverse demographic

1 and geographic groups to provide representation about the
2 Valley water interests.

3 I believe she also has board experience that
4 directly applies to the commission work, also.

5 And her letters of recommendations also talk
6 about her bridge building skills in achieving consensus in
7 a group dynamic.

8 I, too, like this candidate and I feel confident
9 that we should move her forward in the applicant tentative
10 pool of 40.

11 MR. AHMADI: Thank you. Thanks, Kerri.

12 CHAIR SPANO: Uh-hum.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: And in case no one is
14 taking note, I will just remind you that you're at 40
15 applicants now. Of course, you can keep going as you see
16 fit, but I wanted to give you sort of a guidepost as to
17 where you are.

18 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, Stephanie. And, in
19 fact, I just wanted to see if it's possible for us to go
20 over the list of who we have in the pool at this moment,
21 and just to make sure that my list is complete.

22 CHAIR SPANO: That's a great idea.

23 MR. AHMADI: And because it doesn't hurt to
24 double check before we move forward. So, this may take a
25 little bit of time, but I think it's well worth it.

1 MS. CAMACHO: Yes.

2 CHAIR SPANO: Yes.

3 MR. AHMADI: So, maybe I should just start
4 alphabetical listing of all the individuals we have.

5 MS. CAMACHO: Do you want to just kind of go,
6 since we already know the three votes that we've already
7 included, do you want to go with the individuals that
8 we've just added on, is that what you're going to go over?

9 MR. AHMADI: I'm open if you're suggesting that
10 we should just go to the individuals that we just added
11 in. But I think in the interest of just completeness, it
12 would benefit me just double checking, making sure that we
13 have the same individuals on our individual lists.

14 So, maybe all the 40, as counsel counted. I
15 haven't so we need to go through the list.

16 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Would you like me to do
17 it?

18 MR. AHMADI: Would you please?

19 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Sure.

20 CHAIR SPANO: Oh, that's great.

21 MR. AHMADI: So, thank you.

22 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay, I'm beginning at
23 the top of the report that we generated that included the
24 applicants who received three favorable recommendations.

25 So, first we have James Aldredge, Teresa Espana,

1 Stuart Flashman.

2 MR. AHMADI: Could you slow down, please? I'm
3 sorry.

4 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Sorry.

5 MR. AHMADI: I'm making some checkmarks on my
6 list. I'm ready.

7 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Stanley Forbes. Connie
8 Galambos Malloy, Sherman Gee, William Hamm, Christine
9 Hernlund, Patrick Jefferson, Kerry Koths, Daniel Levin,
10 Byrd Lochtie, Carl Luna, Conny McCormack, Paul McKastle,
11 Daniel Montello, Patrick Nunes, Robert Panerio, M.
12 Parvenu, Patrick Perez, Josefa Salinas, Edward
13 Scheidegger, DJ or Donna Jo Soviero, Maria Stewart,
14 Kathryn Tobias.

15 And now, adding in the individuals that you have
16 begun to place on your tentative pool, Gregory Francis,
17 Peggy Lopez, Tamina Alon, Jerry Turem, Vincent Casalaina,
18 Stephen Allen, Velveth Schmitz, Vylma Ortiz, Thais
19 Armenta, Linda Civitello, Matthew Lorono, Jacquelyn
20 Estrada, Robert Silva, Lacey Holtzen and Michelle
21 Diguilio-Matz.

22 MS. CAMACHO: That's what I have.

23 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, that's what I have.

24 CHAIR SPANO: Well, at this point do you feel
25 confident in the pool as it is right now or do you --

1 would you like to bring up, Nasir, other names?

2 MS. CAMACHO: There's a couple more I'd like to
3 add to the pool.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

5 MS. CAMACHO: I know we're at 40, but I'd like
6 to put them in, also, for us to look at.

7 CHAIR SPANO: I do, too.

8 MR. AHMADI: I also have one, but I'll go after
9 you, Mary.

10 MS. CAMACHO: Okay. Did you want to go?

11 CHAIR SPANO: I did. I had some, also, that I'd
12 like to discuss for further consideration. It's my turn
13 right now, right?

14 MR. AHMADI: I believe so.

15 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. I'd like to bring forward
16 candidate Robert Borneman, B-o-r-n-e-m-a-n.

17 I think one of the key strengths that I noted,
18 noticed about this candidate was his awareness and
19 knowledge about census data and mapping, in his analytical
20 response.

21 He also is a student teacher. And in his
22 geography response to appreciation for geography, he shows
23 really strong appreciation and understanding for the
24 geography differences in the State of California, and he
25 bases it on his actual travels throughout the State of

1 California.

2 His letters also speak very highly of his
3 enthusiasm and dedication, and his impartiality and how
4 fair he was in grading his students.

5 They believe he's very motivated to do
6 commission work, as he's shown motivation throughout his
7 student and academic life.

8 Mary, Nasir, at this -- oh, this candidate
9 especially is significant because he represents Ventura
10 County, also, a county I don't believe we have admitted in
11 the pool, yet, or considered for the pool, yet.

12 MS. CAMACHO: I have a concern, a major concern
13 with this applicant. With some of the responses the
14 applicant provided, it's hard for me to determine if this
15 applicant would follow the laws and regulations as set
16 forth.

17 Most notably, the Voting Rights Act. One of his
18 responses in there is I do not believe in color
19 designations and that kind of concerns me with, I mean,
20 how would he deal with --

21 CHAIR SPANO: Where is this?

22 MS. CAMACHO: Oh, this is on page number two.

23 CHAIR SPANO: Response to question number two or
24 page two?

25 MS. CAMACHO: Page two. So, go to page two and

1 you look at his racial/ethnic background and he marks
2 Other.

3 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

4 MS. CAMACHO: That's a very -- a concern for me,
5 and I don't know if he would be able to follow the voting
6 rights -- the Voting Right Act.

7 MR. AHMADI: Can I add?

8 CHAIR SPANO: Uh-hum.

9 MR. AHMADI: I had the exact same concern. And
10 the reason why this individual was not in my tentative 40
11 to begin with, looking back at my initial vote or the
12 previous vote, I found this individual's abilities and
13 skills to be qualified and strong.

14 I did come across the response to the question
15 about racial and ethnic background and his response does
16 say do not believe in color designation. And even though
17 I have some concern about that response, I think at this
18 point that may be a good question to raise in an
19 interview, for example, to ask for clarification, because
20 I don't know what the intention is there in terms of maybe
21 the individual is trying to say that everybody's equal, or
22 maybe the individual is trying to tell us that he can
23 relate to any racial background, or people of any racial
24 background.

25 So, even though on the face of it, the statement

1 is not a clear response to that question, I think it's
2 worth a try to give this individual a chance to come back
3 and, after we agree whether or not this is one of the
4 tentative 40 individuals, to raise that question in the
5 interview and have him clarify what it means by that --
6 what he means by that.

7 So, again, I agree with Kerri to have this
8 individual a chance to be back in the pool and considered
9 for an interview.

10 MS. CAMACHO: We can put him in the pool but I,
11 you know, I just wanted to voice my concern.

12 I know that we're going over. I might also
13 discuss him again because we have to get down to 40.

14 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

15 MS. CAMACHO: So, I just kind of wanted to voice
16 my concern.

17 CHAIR SPANO: No, I hear your concern, Mary. I
18 hear your concern. I think this other area of racial and
19 ethnic background sometimes throws me for a loop. But
20 with this candidate, I did not see it as a problem from
21 prohibiting him from moving forward into the pool.

22 I didn't see this candidate, especially with
23 diversity, I didn't see those signs of maybe showing a
24 partiality to a certain ethnic group or a non-belief about
25 appreciating diversity in the State of California. It

1 wasn't that apparent to me.

2 But it would be good to ask this candidate about
3 how he responded to that.

4 So, I understand your concern, Mary, and I'm
5 still willing to consider this candidate to remain in the
6 pool for further consideration.

7 MS. CAMACHO: Okay.

8 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you.

9 MS. CAMACHO: I would like to bring for
10 consideration Kimberley Wormley.

11 MR. AHMADI: That's who I have on my list, Mary,
12 so I'm glad that you bring her in.

13 MS. CAMACHO: Oh, okay. She serves the homeless
14 in San Luis Obispo, so she's out there with the community.
15 She volunteers with different organizations. She provided
16 responses that were clear and concise.

17 I'm pretty impressed that here's a female in the
18 engineering field, that's pretty commendable. And that
19 requires a lot of qualitative and quantitative analysis,
20 so the analytics, I think, are very strong.

21 MR. AHMADI: I completely agree. As I
22 mentioned, she was on my list to -- back to the tentative
23 pool. And she has strong skills. And by the way, she
24 received a favorable vote from all of us last time, so
25 that's an indication of her abilities and skills.

1 CHAIR SPANO: I liked this candidate, especially
2 her diversity response, where she seems to be very
3 sensitive to the disparate points of issues, particularly
4 water, highway spending and a variety of issues common to
5 her community, which is San Luis Obispo, so she represents
6 Stanislaus County.

7 And I thought her strengths were community of
8 interest and awareness of the political preferences of
9 people in that area.

10 She also volunteers at churches and offers her
11 time and quite often. She's also a teacher in that area.
12 I think her strengths as a teacher, she listens very well,
13 and she listens to different perspectives of problems from
14 many different groups. I think that's a quality and skill
15 absolutely necessary for a commissioner.

16 At this point I'd agree that we should consider
17 moving this candidate forward to the tentative pool of 40.

18 MS. CAMACHO: Thank you.

19 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

20 MS. CAMACHO: Do you have --

21 MR. AHMADI: I do not have anybody else to add
22 to the pool at this point so --

23 CHAIR SPANO: Mary, did you have another
24 candidate at all?

25 MS. CAMACHO: There's one other candidate I

1 wanted to bring forward for discussion and that's Ryan
2 Stuck.

3 This applicant, he's a software designer, so
4 it's another aspect that would be beneficial for the
5 commissioner. Also, he is -- he thrives in tough
6 environments. And his information in here really leads me
7 to believe that he would be able to do the job.

8 Do you guys have any comments or anything to
9 say?

10 CHAIR SPANO: I, also observed that he's strong
11 -- I guess he previously worked at HP as a software and
12 technical, electrical engineer. His strengths are
13 computer and his writing skills are stellar.

14 I agree, this candidate exhibits positive
15 characteristics that are necessary for commission work.

16 MR. AHMADI: And, again, I was on the fence on
17 this one, so I would love to have a chance to go back to
18 the application and reassess, and just remind myself of
19 the details. So, I agree.

20 CHAIR SPANO: So, this candidate will move
21 forward to the applicant pool of forward to be considered.

22 And I just want to make a correction, I guess
23 when I -- I misspoke, San Luis Obispo is not in Stanislaus
24 County, it's in the Central Coastal. I'm sorry, there's
25 another candidate I want to describe that is from there,

1 so I got them mixed up. I apologize.

2 The next candidate I would like to actually
3 bring forward for discussion is Beverly Finley, F-i-n-l-e-
4 y.

5 Let's see. This candidate has strong outreach
6 ability. She served as an interim CEO for the Modesto
7 Symphony Orchestra. She has outreach experience with the
8 larger Modesto community on a regular basis.

9 She was also responsible for business operations
10 and personal management, which adds another element
11 necessary for -- that could assist in commission work.

12 Let's see. She actually made an effort to
13 describe real life experiences related to her description
14 of impartiality that I found really a big strength with
15 this candidate.

16 Mary, Nasir, how do you feel about this
17 candidate?

18 MS. CAMACHO: This applicant I just wasn't sure
19 about because I didn't see the tie of all of her diversity
20 experience to California. But I do see that, you know,
21 she did move to Nigeria and this is in 1973, she moved her
22 whole family there, so she probably could bring an aspect
23 of that, that understanding that she obtained while there
24 to California, California's diversity.

25 And also, her work up in, I think it's Seattle,

1 Washington -- it was in Washington.

2 So, I just, I was a little hesitant about her
3 because she didn't really tie it to California.

4 But I do see that she has all these other
5 experiences and I think they tie really well.

6 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

7 MR. AHMADI: So, I came into this meeting with
8 having an unfavorable vote for this individual and here's
9 why; like Mary, I was a little concerned about the
10 response that she had provided for appreciation of
11 California's diversity and demographic diversity.

12 I do see value in analytical skills and other
13 skills that relates to, you know, her profession, you
14 know, the background in orchestra and outreach that she
15 had in Modesto, basically.

16 So, even though I was concerned a little bit
17 about the response to the diversity or her understanding
18 of the diversity of California, I think I will take a
19 second look at that.

20 So, for that reason, I'm okay to put them back
21 into the tentative list of 40 and then we'll -- I'll take
22 a look at the details.

23 CHAIR SPANO: I understand your concern about
24 having non-California experience, but I feel that this
25 candidate does -- could demonstrate an ability to reach

1 out to other areas in California. I think she's
2 demonstrated that well outside of California.

3 And she's actually shown an appreciation for
4 diversity, also, in her response.

5 So, I guess at this time are you comfortable
6 moving her into the pool for further consideration?

7 MR. AHMADI: Yes, I am.

8 MS. CAMACHO: Yes.

9 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. So, how do the panel
10 members feel about where we are right now in the candidate
11 pool?

12 MS. CAMACHO: I'm --

13 CHAIR SPANO: I'm sorry?

14 MS. CAMACHO: I'm pretty pleased with the group
15 that we do have. It does look like we've kind of gone
16 over and that we're going to have to assess a few. But I
17 agree that I don't have any other additional applicants
18 I'd like to add to this pool.

19 CHAIR SPANO: Nasir?

20 MR. AHMADI: I may have additional applicants to
21 add to the pool, but I think at this point I would be
22 comfortable if I -- if we take a break and look back at
23 those that we do have at this point in time. In my count,
24 I believe we have 45. So, obviously, at the end of
25 this --

1 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We have 44.

2 MR. AHMADI: Forty-four, thank you, Counsel.

3 CHAIR SPANO: Does counsel want to confirm the

4 additional people or should I, or should --

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I'm happy to, if you'd

6 like.

7 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. Yes, please.

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It may not be a bad idea

9 to go over the list of the 44, maybe take public comment

10 before you take your break.

11 CHAIR SPANO: Sure.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: And then you may need to

13 limit it, depending upon how much work you have ahead of

14 you.

15 MR. AHMADI: Okay.

16 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay, so maybe I'll go a

17 little faster this time, at least through the first 40.

18 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

19 MR. AHMADI: If you're too fast, I'll stop you.

20 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Thank you.

21 James Aldredge, Teresa Espana, Stuart Flashman,

22 Stanley Forbes, Connie Galambos Malloy, Sherman Gee,

23 William Hamm, Christine Hernlund, Patrick Jefferson, Kerry

24 Koths, Daniel Levin, Byrd Lochtie, Carl Luna, Conny

25 McCormack, Paul McKastle, Daniel Montello, Patrick Nunes,

1 Robert Panerio, M. Parvenu, Patrick Perez, Josefa Salinas,
2 Edward Scheidegger, DJ, Donna Jo, Soviero, Maria Stewart,
3 Kathryn Tobias, Gregory Francis, Peggy Lopez, Tamina Alon,
4 Jerry Turem, Vincent Casalaina, Stephen Allen, Velveth
5 Schmitz, Vylma Ortiz, Thais Armenta, Linda Civitello,
6 Matthew Lorono, Jacquelyn Estrada, Robert Silva, Lacey
7 Holtzen, Michelle Diguilio-Matz, Robert Borneman, Kimberly
8 Wormley, Ryan Stuck, and Beverly Finley.

9 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

10 CHAIR SPANO: Now that you have all heard the
11 list of additional applicants to be considered in this
12 pool, do we have any members of the public that would like
13 to make public comment?

14 MR. WRIGHT: Referring -- this is Jim Wright,
15 again. Referring to the list that I provided you earlier,
16 number five, about people that have juris doctorates, in
17 the list that you just enumerated there are eight and
18 that's 18 percent of the total.

19 Only two of them, as far as I'm concerned, have
20 what would be serious problems. I believe Stuart Flashman
21 was on the list and he's an attorney.

22 And where's the other one? And then there's
23 Kathryn Tobias and she is staff counsel for the State
24 Department of Parks and Recreation, which I think is a
25 significant conflict. Thank you.

1 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you for your comment.

2 Please step up.

3 MS. FENG: My name is Kathay Feng and I'm with
4 California Common Cause. I'm just going to focus the
5 comments on the 28 applicants who got one or two
6 favorable.

7 And there was one applicant, in particular, who,
8 in talking with a number of different groups her name came
9 up as a positive recommendation, and that was Tamina Alon,
10 who you all have potentially suggested moving on to the
11 next round for possible interviews.

12 She formerly was the UC Berkeley Statewide
13 Database, which gives her very unique skills in terms of
14 having GIS analytical skills, but also studying certain
15 populations' voting behavior. And it's to the level of
16 specificity where I think she could really bring those
17 added skill sets, not just general analytical, but
18 specific to the Commission's work, to the work of the
19 Commission.

20 And I note that she's listed as Other," but as
21 you rightly point out, she is of Filipino and Puerto Rican
22 background. And I think that that mixed race background
23 actually also gives her a unique sensitivity to diversity
24 issues.

25 And please don't hold the fact that I think at

1 one time she has secured a law degree, and that's not a
2 bad thing.

3 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Are there anymore members of the
5 public that would like to speak at this time?

6 Okay. Well, since we have 44, and now that we
7 have to get down to 40, should we take another 15 to 20
8 minutes to go back to our offices and reassess this pool?

9 MR. AHMADI: Could we -- I'm sorry, can we take
10 a little longer break?

11 CHAIR SPANO: What would you propose, Nasir?

12 MR. AHMADI: Maybe half an hour.

13 CHAIR SPANO: Half an hour. Is that agreeable
14 to you, Mary?

15 MS. CAMACHO: That's fine.

16 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, for --

17 MR. AHMADI: Since it's only 1:20, I think --

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: So, it is 1:20 and so
19 you'll return at -- did you want to --

20 MS. FENG: I just had a process question.

21 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

22 MS. FENG: I flew up from Los Angeles and am
23 very excited that you're spending this much time on each
24 applicant. My only question is, if we have comments about
25 the Republican pool or the Democratic pool and it seems as

1 if we're coming towards the tail end of today, and we
2 won't physically be here today, how can we provide those
3 thoughts to you in real time, or is there a way to do
4 that?

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You can give them to us
6 today. I don't think there's a way to do them tomorrow,
7 unless you submit something in writing.

8 MS. FENG: Okay.

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: The way we're headed, I'm
10 hopeful that we'll finish in time to get to those
11 interview schedules.

12 MR. FENG: Okay.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: But then we will probably
14 have a few minutes, if you just wanted to give your
15 comments, that would be fine.

16 MS. FENG: Okay, that's all. Because, I'm
17 sorry, but I won't be able to join you for the next two
18 days, but I'll be watching you via video, on live feed.

19 But I did want to make some comments and I don't
20 know which direction the panelists are going with the
21 other two pools, but I wanted to say something about
22 folks.

23 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

24 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay, so you're at 1:21
25 and you're going to come back at 1:51.

1 CHAIR SPANO: At 1:51.

2 MR. AHMADI: Okay, thank you.

3 CHAIR SPANO: Okay, thank you.

4 (Off the record at 1:21 p.m.)

5 (Back on the record at 1:58 p.m.)

6 CHAIR SPANO: We're back on the record, it's
7 1:58.

8 We've had a chance to now revisit the pool of 44
9 candidates that we now face to reduce to 40 applicants for
10 the pool of the Others."

11 I had a chance to look at it further, in a
12 little bit more detail. And as I was looking at the
13 candidates, again, I recall your concern, Mary, about the
14 candidate Robert Borneman. And as I read it, I understand
15 your concerns about the seriousness of his ability, about
16 his response in the application.

17 And I think it's important to note that in the
18 VRA that people out to recognize people of different
19 color, of different races and ethnicities.

20 And since it appears that this candidate also
21 represents an area where we have sufficient diversity, I
22 think that he represents, let's see, the Southern Cal.
23 area, that I feel we can remove him from the pool from
24 further consideration.

25 MS. CAMACHO: I agree with that -- sorry about

1 that, you guys.

2 I agree. I would feel comfortable with removing
3 Robert Borneman.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

5 MR. AHMADI: Yes, and I totally agree with your
6 comments, Kerri.

7 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

8 MR. AHMADI: And that was one of my main
9 concerns about this one. Because not only it's a question
10 about whether or not the application is complete, because
11 the answer to the race and ethnicity is stated as
12 European/American, do not believe in color designation.

13 But also, as you mentioned, you know, we're
14 supposed to take into consideration all these different
15 diversity elements, so this will make it difficult for us
16 to interpret that information.

17 Even though, initially, I stated that maybe this
18 is something to discuss in an interview, but I think that
19 there's enough reason to say that compared to the rest
20 that we have in the pool this is probably weak.

21 So, I agree that this is maybe one of those that
22 we should eliminate from the pool.

23 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

24 MR. AHMADI: Mary, did you have a candidate?

25 MS. CAMACHO: Going back up to my room and

1 taking a look over these candidates, it was so hard for
2 me, and I'm sure for my other panel members, to determine
3 which applicants to suggest that we remove from this pool,
4 they are so qualified.

5 However, we have to get to 40. So, if I had to
6 select somebody, and we do have a large representation
7 from the Bay Area, I looked at the Bay Area. And one of
8 the individuals that I would put on the list to remove is
9 Linda Civitello.

10 She's outstanding, but if I have to say
11 something about, you know, her qualifications is she did
12 really emphasis just health issues. So, I would be
13 comfortable of putting her on the list of -- or taking her
14 off the list of our tentative interviewees.

15 MR. AHMADI: This is a very difficult decision
16 for me, to be honest, honestly, and this is the one that I
17 voted as favorable since the last review that we had.

18 And I agree with you that the law requires us to
19 have 40, so we have no choice but to make these hard
20 decisions. And with all due respect for the ones that we
21 do say or agree that we should eliminate, it's not a
22 reflection of their talents or anything, it's just about,
23 you know, we have to make these decisions and comply with
24 the law that we are charged with.

25 So, for that reason, I have to agree with you,

1 Mary.

2 CHAIR SPANO: As I sized up the pool of 44 I
3 realized, also, that we have sufficient and a lot of
4 representation in the Bay Area and Southern California.
5 This applicant represents the Bay Area. And I felt
6 comfortable -- actually, this is one I was going to
7 consider and bring up for removal from the pool, so I'm
8 glad you agree, Mary and Nasir.

9 MS. CAMACHO: Yeah.

10 MR. AHMADI: Thank you. So, I went back and
11 looked at all the ones that I have in my list, of course,
12 and the ones that we have in the tentative 40, or 44 at
13 this point. Again, it's difficult to make a decision in
14 terms of, you know, saying no to somebody because the
15 talent is so impressive on these individuals and they have
16 gone through all these reviews and we found them -- they
17 made it to this level of, you know, process so that's
18 great.

19 But with all due respect, I'd like to suggest
20 that we should remove Lacey Holtzen from the pool.
21 Because when I compare the qualifications and other
22 elements, I found this individual to be a little weaker
23 because it was initially not in my one of 40 tentative
24 favorable votes. So, I continue to hold that position and
25 say that this may be a good candidate to remove from the

1 pool at this point.

2 CHAIR SPANO: I agree with you, Nasir. I feel
3 that we have sufficient representation for this candidate.
4 We also have good candidates in the North and Central
5 Valley area. And I also feel like her skills and
6 abilities are noted in other applicants that are remaining
7 in the pool, so I think we're covered there.

8 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

9 CHAIR SPANO: Mary, did you agree or --

10 MS. CAMACHO: Oh, just --

11 CHAIR SPANO: Oh, I'm sorry.

12 MS. CAMACHO: I'm just kind of looking at her,
13 looking at just a few things.

14 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

15 MS. CAMACHO: And just one second.

16 CHAIR SPANO: No problem.

17 MS. CAMACHO: After looking at her application
18 it's like what my panel members are saying, this is so
19 difficult because these people are so talented, but we do
20 have to get down to the 40. And I'd have to agree that
21 our representation in the Northern Central Valley and even
22 in the Sacramento area is -- I think is good.

23 So, I will -- I agree with you that we should
24 remove her from the tentative interview pool.

25 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. I do have another

1 candidate, but does anyone else have on that they'd like
2 to share?

3 MS. CAMACHO: No, go ahead.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. I'm going to propose
5 removal of Vincent Casalaina. I feel that his skills are
6 also, and abilities, are fully represented in our existing
7 pool right now and that he's also declined to state --
8 heavy on "declined to states," also. So, I feel that
9 we're adequately covered, also, for that.

10 I don't know what your thoughts are?

11 MR. AHMADI: Again, one of those difficult ones
12 because just a few minutes ago I suggested that we should
13 put her back in the pool.

14 CHAIR SPANO: Yeah.

15 MR. AHMADI: And the reason I did that,
16 obviously, I saw a lot of quality and talent in this
17 individual. But again, in the interest of having
18 compliance with the legal requirements and having a pool
19 of 40, I'll have to agree with you, Kerri. So, I'm okay
20 with that.

21 MS. CAMACHO: I also agree with both of you. I
22 found this person very talented but we do have to get down
23 to the 40, and these are hard decisions. So, this is I
24 agree that we should remove this applicant from the
25 tentative interview list.

1 CHAIR SPANO: Well, that's, according to my
2 math, that's four that we have removed, so we should have
3 40 remaining.

4 And as I see it, it looks like we have a pretty
5 diverse pool of 40. We have good coverage in the Bay
6 Area, at the regional level, and as well as at the county
7 level. I see that we have representation in Humboldt and
8 Lake County, that you don't see common in a lot of the
9 sub-pools.

10 It looks like we achieved a fairly good economic
11 breakdown of candidates, as well as a good female/male
12 breakdown.

13 But I'm impressed with our ability to get the
14 diversity and the racial/ethnic breakdown, it looks like a
15 fair representation.

16 What are your thoughts on that?

17 MS. CAMACHO: I agree. These were definitely
18 hard decisions and I think the 40 that we have are amazing
19 and their life experiences that they bring to the
20 Commission, and the board experience, the public
21 experience, the community involvement is just amazing.

22 So, I think these 40 will just be a wonderful
23 people to interview.

24 CHAIR SPANO: Yes.

25 MR. AHMADI: Yeah, I totally agree. Obviously,

1 we discussed these since this morning and I've very happy
2 that we reached a point where we can move forward, which
3 is important.

4 At this point, if I can ask the counsel to just
5 go over the names one more time just to make sure, I would
6 appreciate that.

7 And if you can please go alphabetical?

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay.

9 MR. AHMADI: Is that okay? I mean, I can --

10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: How about if I list them.
11 I don't have them alphabetically.

12 MR. AHMADI: Okay.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: How about if I list them.
14 But I think it's also, maybe a good idea, in terms of
15 potential name duplication, although I don't think that's
16 likely at this point --

17 MR. AHMADI: Sure.

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: -- to include their
19 applicant ID numbers. Would that be helpful?

20 MR. AHMADI: Sure.

21 MS. CAMACHO: That would be good.

22 MR. AHMADI: Yeah.

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay. The first
24 applicant is applicant number 29117, James Aldredge.

25 MR. AHMADI: I'm sorry, is it possible to read

1 the last name first, because my list is by the last name
2 and then the applicant number.

3 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Sure.

4 MR. AHMADI: I would appreciate that.

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Sure, okay.

6 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

7 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Starting again, applicant
8 ID 29117, Aldredge, James.

9 21633, Espana, Teresa.

10 1057, Flashman, Stuart.

11 MR. AHMADI: Stephanie, I'm sorry, I have to
12 stop you, I'm sorry. If you can read the last name,
13 first, and then the applicant ID number?

14 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay.

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

16 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Let's start again.
17 Aldredge, James, applicant number 29117.

18 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

19 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Espana, Teresa, applicant
20 number 21633.

21 Flashman, Stuart, applicant number 1057.

22 Forbes, Stanley, applicant number 5926.

23 Galambos Malloy, Connie, applicant number 17483.

24 Gee, Sherman, applicant number 14453.

25 Hamm, William, applicant number 3167.

1 Hernlund, Christine, applicant number 25313.
2 Jefferson, Patrick, applicant number 25120.
3 Koths, Kerry, applicant number 2797.
4 Levin, Daniel, applicant number 14474.
5 Lochtie, Byrd, applicant number 24657.
6 Luna, Carl, applicant number 18475.
7 McCormack, Conny, applicant number 8246.
8 McKastle, Paul, applicant number 4423.
9 Montello, Daniel, applicant number 4558.
10 Nunes, Patrick, applicant number 5216.
11 Panerio, Robert, applicant number 12753.
12 Parvenu, M., applicant number 20225.
13 Perez, Patrick, applicant number 32729.
14 Salinas, Josefa, applicant number 8049.
15 Scheidegger, Edward, applicant number 2576.
16 Soviero, DJ, or Donna Jo, applicant number 7737.
17 Stewart, Maria, applicant number 499.
18 Tobias, Kathryn, applicant number 3950.
19 Francis, Gregory, applicant number 33721.
20 Lopez, Peggy, applicant number 11239.
21 Alon, Tamina, applicant number 2930.
22 Turem, Jerry, applicant number 10521.
23 Allen, Stephen, applicant number 6481.
24 Schmitz, Velveth, applicant number 12003.
25 Ortiz, Vylma, applicant number 13657.

1 Armenta, Thais, applicant number 18438.
2 Lorono, Matthew, applicant number 10161.
3 Estrada, Jacquelyn, applicant number 29776.
4 Silva, Robert, applicant number 11546.
5 Diguilio-Matz, Michelle, applicant number 18242.
6 Wormley, Kimberly, applicant number 27287.
7 Stuck, Ryan, applicant number 27680.
8 Finley, Beverly, applicant number 5760.
9 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.
10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay.
11 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you, Stephanie.
12 Now that we've confirmed our list of 40
13 applicants, would any of the members of the public like to
14 comment?
15 Oh, okay. Yes.
16 MR. AHMADI: She doesn't have a mike.
17 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. Then I propose, at this
18 point, that we -- I move to make a motion that we
19 interview the following 40 applicants, who are not
20 affiliated with either major party.
21 Actually, let me back up there. Let's see, I'd
22 like to make two motions.
23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Why don't you move your
24 40 first.
25 CHAIR SPANO: Move the 40 first?

1 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Correct.

2 CHAIR SPANO: That we posited?

3 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Correct.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Why don't you list them

6 just by their first and last name one more time in your

7 motion.

8 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you. Okay. May I have

9 that?

10 Then I move that we interview the following 40

11 applicants, who are not affiliated with either major party

12 and I'm going to list them as follows:

13 Aldredge, James.

14 I'll do first name and last name.

15 Teresa --

16 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Why don't you withdraw

17 and start over.

18 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. I'll withdraw that motion

19 and start over.

20 Again, I move that we interview the following 40

21 applicants, who are not affiliated with either major party

22 and I'm going to list them as follows: James Aldredge,

23 Teresa Espana, Stuart Flashman, Stanley Forbes, Connie

24 Galambos Malloy, Sherman Gee, William Hamm, Christine

25 Hernlund, Patrick Jefferson, Kerry Koths, Daniel Levin,

1 Byrd Lochtie, Carl Luna, Conny McCormack, Paul McKastle,
2 Daniel Montello, Patrick Nunes, Robert Panerio, M.
3 Parvenu, Patrick Perez, Josefa Salinas, Edward
4 Scheidegger, DJ, Donna Jo, Soverio, Maria Stewart, Kathryn
5 Tobias, Gregory Francis, Peggy Lopez, Tamina Alon, Jerry
6 Turem, Stephen Allen, Velveth Schmitz, Vylma Ortiz, Thais
7 Armenta, Vincent Casalaina --

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: No.

9 CHAIR SPANO: -- Matthew Lorono --

10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: No.

11 MR. AHMADI: No.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Do you want me to make
13 the motion for you?

14 CHAIR SPANO: No, I got it. Scratch that. Do I
15 have to start over?

16 MR. AHMADI: Maybe you can withdraw the motion
17 now and just redo it again.

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I would, for clarity's
19 sake, I would.

20 CHAIR SPANO: One more time.

21 MS. CAMACHO: Do you want to have counsel do
22 that for us?

23 CHAIR SPANO: No, I just didn't have his name
24 fully crossed off on my list.

25 MS. CAMACHO: Okay.

1 CHAIR SPANO: I just had the number crossed off.

2 MS. CAMACHO: There are so many things on there,
3 huh?

4 CHAIR SPANO: I just read the name.

5 So, I apologize, let's do it one more time.

6 I withdraw that motion and I move to make
7 another motion.

8 I move that we interview the following 40
9 applicants, who are not affiliated with either major
10 party, and I'm going to be again listing them as follows:

11 James Aldredge, Teresa Espana, Stuart Flashman,
12 Stanley Forbes, Connie Galambos Malloy, Sherman Gee,
13 William Hamm, Christine Hernlund, Patrick Jefferson, Kerry
14 Koths, Daniel Levin, Byrd Lochtie, Carl Luna, Conny
15 McCormack, Paul McKastle, Daniel Montello, Patrick Nunes,
16 Robert Panerio, M. Parvenu, Patrick Perez, Josefa Salinas,
17 Edward Scheidegger, DJ, Donna JO, Soverio, Maria Stewart,
18 Kathryn Tobias, Gregory Francis, Peggy Lopez, Tamina Alon,
19 Jerry Turem, Stephen Allen, Velveth Schmitz, Vylma Ortiz,
20 Thais Armenta, Matthew Lorono, Jacquelyn Estrada, Robert
21 Silva, Michelle Diguilio-Matz, Kimberly Wormley, Ryan
22 Stuck and Beverly Finley.

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Is there a second?

24 MR. AHMADI: I second that.

25 CHAIR SPANO: All in favor say aye?

1 (Ayes.)

2 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: All opposed?

3 CHAIR SPANO: All opposed?

4 There being no opposition, the motion is

5 carried.

6 MR. AHMADI: Perfect.

7 CHAIR SPANO: I got to get a drink.

8 MS. CAMACHO: I'm impressed, I would have messed

9 up those names. I'm very impressed.

10 CHAIR SPANO: Well, three times, that's not

11 good. Maybe by the time we talk about democrats, I'll get

12 it down.

13 So, moving on, let's see. Well, we've now

14 completed our goal of identifying the 40 others who will

15 be invited to participate in interviews.

16 Counsel has asked me to skip to Agenda Item 7,

17 so that we can decide on an interview schedule today and

18 give the Bureau staff sufficient time to start planning

19 around the schedule.

20 Counsel has prepared a memorandum --

21 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You know, before you

22 leave that agenda item, you might move to eliminate all

23 remaining applicants who are not affiliated with either

24 major party.

25 CHAIR SPANO: Oh, I moved too fast, sorry.

1 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You moved too fast.

2 CHAIR SPANO: Yeah, did.

3 Okay, let me back up one more time. Okay, my
4 second motion that I need to make, that I know I mentioned
5 earlier, is that I move to eliminate from the applicant
6 pool all remaining applicants who are not affiliated with
7 either Democrat or Republican parties.

8 Is there a second?

9 MS. CAMACHO: I second that.

10 CHAIR SPANO: All in favor?

11 (Ayes.)

12 CHAIR SPANO: All opposed?

13 There being no opposition, the motion's carried.

14 Okay, we've completed our 40 others, so let's
15 get back to what I was talking about before.

16 Counsel has prepared a memorandum for us and
17 that memo is at the back of the room. So, if members of
18 the public would like to see it, please feel free to get
19 one.

20 Mary and Nasir, have you had a chance to review
21 the proposed four interview schedules that Stephanie and
22 Diane has prepared for us?

23 MR. AHMADI: Yes, we have. I have.

24 MS. CAMACHO: Yes, I did.

25 CHAIR SPANO: Okay.

1 MR. AHMADI: If I can start, please?

2 CHAIR SPANO: Sure.

3 MR. AHMADI: Okay, yeah.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Please, feel free.

5 MR. AHMADI: I really do appreciate the fact

6 that we start the meetings at 9:15, because I think it's

7 important for the individuals who are coming to the

8 interview to have sufficient time to make it through the

9 traffic, and I believe that some of these individuals may

10 be coming from out-of-area locations.

11 So, I think 9:15 as a start date, in general,

12 will work perfect for that purpose. And also, for my

13 schedule as well, because I have my kids that I drop off

14 to school at eight o'clock in the morning, so that's good.

15 In terms of the breaks, I think I would like to

16 have a 15-minute break so --

17 MS. CAMACHO: I agree with you, Nasir. I agree,

18 the 15-minute breaks would be very helpful.

19 MR. AHMADI: Okay, thank you. Those are the

20 only two concerns that I have, that I wanted to share.

21 CHAIR SPANO: Actually, I like scenario number

22 two, where -- and I'm assuming that's the schedule you're

23 referring to, where we interview five interviews in one

24 day, about an hour and a half each, with 15-minute breaks,

25 and a half-hour lunch.

1 MR. AHMADI: Yes. In fact, I was referring
2 to -- because that's the first scenario where we have 15-
3 minute breaks, still starting at 9:15, ending at six
4 o'clock every day.

5 And I think one reason that I like that schedule
6 is that we have to be prepared, in terms of emergencies
7 and all that, because the sooner -- the more interviews we
8 do in a day, I know it's pressing and we'll be tired, the
9 more -- the lesser the risk of maybe running out of time
10 at the end.

11 So, for that reason, I'd like to go with this
12 second scenario.

13 MS. CAMACHO: I agree with the second scenario.
14 Also, I'm thinking that an hour and a half is adequate
15 time for all the questions that may be asked, and the
16 standard questions.

17 In addition, we, as panel members, have to
18 prepare for these interviews, so that's going to take time
19 and I think this will allow us time to prepare for the
20 next day's interviews.

21 CHAIR SPANO: Okay. Would anybody like to
22 comment on the interview schedule proposed?

23 **Public Comment**

24 MR. WRIGHT: If I may, Jim Wright, again.

25 Have you considered using Saturdays for

1 interviews?

2 MR. AHMADI: Could you repeat the question
3 again, please, I didn't hear it?

4 MR. WRIGHT: Have you considered using Saturdays
5 for your interviews, as well as the weekdays?

6 MR. AHMADI: Counsel, would you take that
7 question, please?

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We did not consider using
9 the Saturdays. We felt pretty strongly that it's probably
10 easier for applicants to deal with their children and
11 their lives if they are -- already have childcare set up
12 during the day.

13 And so, we also need weekends to do our work, to
14 prepare for the next round of interviews that are coming
15 in a week.

16 MR. WRIGHT: If your candidates are having
17 problems with childcare just to get to an interview that
18 last for two hours, on a weekday, how are they possibly
19 going to participate as commissioners?

20 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I don't know.

21 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

22 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you for your comments.

23 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, sir.

24 CHAIR SPANO: Is there any further public
25 comment on the interview schedules?

1 Then I move that we adopt the interview schedule
2 described in the proposed interview schedule, for one-and-
3 a-half-hour interviews, five interviews per day, beginning
4 9:15, ending at 6:00 p.m., suggested in counsel intermemo,
5 entitled "Suggested Interview Questions and Proposed
6 Interview Schedules."

7 Is there a second?

8 MR. AHMADI: I second it.

9 MS. CAMACHO: I second it.

10 MR. AHMADI: So, we have a third.

11 CHAIR SPANO: All in favor say aye?

12 (Ayes.)

13 CHAIR SPANO: All opposed?

14 There being no opposition, the motion is
15 carried.

16 We'll go ahead and revisit Agenda 7 later on
17 this week, we just needed to get the interview schedule
18 out of the way.

19 So, this brings us to our general comment
20 period. Would any of the members of the public like to
21 comment at this time?

22 MS. FENG: This is good because I have a plane
23 to catch at 3:30, so I'm going to be running out of here.

24 Just generically speaking, we did the quick
25 numbers on the group of 15 that you just moved forward,

1 along with added to the total of 80, and the diversity
2 statistics, just for racial background, are looking very
3 good.

4 So, without sort of belaboring it, I would say
5 that you all are moving very much on the right track.

6 Women are officially at 50 percent of the
7 applicant pool.

8 CHAIR SPANO: All right.

9 MS. FENG: So, fantastic, we're finally up to
10 par. And I would say that as we --

11 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Can I -- I know you have
12 a plane to catch, just to clarify, are you talking about
13 everybody who's left or just the subgroup of Others?"

14 MS. FENG: If you look at the 15 plus the --

15 MS. CAMACHO: Twenty-five?

16 MR. AHMADI: Yeah, the 25.

17 MS. FENG: No, the total of 80, now, that --
18 sorry.

19 MS. CAMACHO: The 40 that we've moved over?

20 MS. FENG: The 40 that you've moved over, plus
21 the 15 that came from the "declined to state/not
22 affiliated with a major party."

23 So, in other words, the people who received
24 three votes.

25 MS. CAMACHO: So, the 25 that received the three

1 votes --

2 MS. FENG: Thank you.

3 MS. CAMACHO: -- and then the 15 we added.

4 MS. FENG: Plus the 15, right.

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Sub-pool of 40. Okay,

6 thanks for clarifying, sorry.

7 MS. CAMACHO: All right.

8 MS. FENG: Correct. I'm sorry, I --

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It's okay.

10 MS. FENG: Math is not my strong point, so I'm

11 hoping I got the numbers right.

12 But as I did my quick calculations, and what's

13 interesting is also that there were quite a few number of

14 people who indicated that their racial background was

15 other, and they actually had a mixed race background, so

16 depending on how you categorize that, the diversity is

17 even greater.

18 So, it's looking extremely good and we want to

19 thank you for taking that into consideration. As you move

20 through the Democrats and Republicans, I think that we're

21 going to be in good stead if we keep this up.

22 So, I'm quickly flipping around. I just wanted

23 to comment on the 42 Democrats who received one or two

24 favorable recommendations, since I think that will be the

25 bulk of the conversation in terms of whether to move on or

1 not to move on, on these people.

2 There were a couple of individuals that I just
3 wanted to highlight who, in discussing with a number of
4 organizations, people got very excited about.

5 And they include Angelo Ancheta, who is
6 currently teaching at Santa Clara Law School, formerly
7 headed up the Asian Law Caucus, which is one of the
8 premier civil rights organizations in California.

9 And he has experience both in Northern and
10 Southern California in civil rights, generally, but also
11 in voting rights, specifically.

12 The next applicant's name is Maria Blanco.
13 Latina background. She is currently teaching in the
14 Contra Costa area, but has worked both in Northern and
15 Southern California.

16 She is one of those icons in the civil rights
17 community in California, particularly, that when you say
18 her name, people said, oh, my God, is she in the applicant
19 pool? Because she has such a wealth of experience, having
20 formerly worked for the Mexican-American Legal Defense and
21 Education Fund, for their Lawyer's Committee on Civil
22 Rights, and now in heading up the Warren Institute at UC
23 Berkeley.

24 She is one of those people who, in the civil
25 rights community, people would say they could breath a

1 sigh of relief that she's on the Commission, if she made
2 it there, because she would truly understand the Voting
3 Rights Act and be able to implement it in a way that
4 people would feel would be even-handed and fairly applying
5 the law.

6 Gregory Freeland is an African-American from the
7 Ventura area. Exciting because he represents the
8 geographic diversity of that coastal region, but he also
9 brings quite a bit of experience on redistricting, having
10 worked in that regional area representing communities up
11 and down the coast.

12 John Gamboa comes from a nonprofit background,
13 previously heading up the Greenlining Institute, which
14 actually organizes low-income, minority communities up and
15 down the state, so he's got statewide experience.

16 Also, working with a diversity of political
17 interests, ranging from chambers of commerce to community
18 building, to low-income communities. Latino, from the Bay
19 Area.

20 And lastly, Martha Jimenez, a Latina from the
21 Southern California area, who is formerly MALDEF attorney.
22 She has also had a wealth of nonprofit experience, so
23 community service, which I know you are looking for.

24 She currently works in a county office, with
25 Supervisor Molina, and I note that she got a number of

1 bipartisan support letters and comments.

2 I would just note this, that although there are
3 a lot of people who do come from Southern California and
4 also from the Bay Area, that Southern California includes
5 some of the largest population centers. And if you look
6 just at Los Angeles, alone, just in terms of statewide
7 population, I think it's approximately one in three people
8 who are from the Los Angeles area, statewide.

9 And if you add to that Orange County and San
10 Diego, it would not be surprising if a disproportionate
11 number of applicants came from that area because that
12 happens to have a large portion of our state's population.

13 And so on that note I bid you good luck. And
14 I'm rooting for this process to be successful because I
15 think that we are being watched, both in the state in
16 terms of politically what people are watching and then,
17 also, nationally.

18 And I'll just leave off with one little note,
19 already, in several other states, people have been talking
20 about the potentially successful experiment in California
21 and introducing bills and resolutions to implement an
22 independent redistricting process in their own states,
23 Minnesota being the most recent.

24 And so, it's exciting stuff and I think that you
25 all are leading us in a very good place to be able to be a

1 model for many other places. Thank you.

2 MR. AHMADI: Thank you so much.

3 MS. CAMACHO: Thank you.

4 CHAIR SPANO: Thank you.

5 Is there any further comment at this time?

6 No. I suggest that it's, what, 2:35 at this

7 time. Panel members, what --

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Recess for the night?

9 CHAIR SPANO: Yeah, I was thinking about that.

10 What are your thoughts?

11 MR. AHMADI: I think it's a good time to just

12 recess for the day and just come back tomorrow and

13 continue with our discussion of the next group.

14 MS. CAMACHO: I agree with you.

15 CHAIR SPANO: I agree.

16 MR. AHMADI: Okay, so we're going to --

17 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: So, we're going to recess

18 until tomorrow morning at --

19 CHAIR SPANO: Yes, at 9:30.

20 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Nine-thirty.

21 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

22 (Meeting recessed at 2:36 p.m.)

23 --oOo--